This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B723
L

LELAND STANFORD JR.
UNIVERSITY
·LIBRARY·

PRESENTED BY THOMAS WELTON STANFORD.

1246
~~3[illegible]~~

6/5

Martin H. Irving
London [illegible]

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

A

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

OF THE

SANSKṚIT, ZEND,

GREEK, LATIN, LITHUANIAN, GOTHIC, GERMAN,

AND SCLAVONIC LANGUAGES.

BY

PROFESSOR F. BOPP.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

EDWARD B. EASTWICK, F.R.S., F.S.A., M.R.A.S.

OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD, MEMBER OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETIES OF PARIS AND
BOMBAY, OF THE GERMAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE PHILOLOGICAL
SOCIETY OF LONDON, HONORARY MEMBER OF THE MADRAS LITERARY
SOCIETY, PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES AND LIBRARIAN IN
THE EAST-INDIA COLLEGE, HAILEYBURY, AND TRANSLATOR OF
THE ZARTASHT NÁMAH, THE ḲIṢṢAH-I-SANJÁN, THE PREM
SÁGAR, THE BÁG̱H̱-O-BAHÁR, THE GULISTÁN, THE
ANVÁR-I-SUHAILÍ, ETC. ETC. ETC.

VOL. I.

SECOND EDITION.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
LONDON, 14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN; AND
EDINBURGH, 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET.

1856.

LONDON:

WILLIAM M. WATTS, CROWN COURT. TEMPLE BAR.

LIBRARY
Leland Stanford, Jr.
UNIVERSITY

a 62459

TO

THE CHAIRMAN, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN,

AND

THE DIRECTORS

OF THE

HONORABLE EAST-INDIA COMPANY,

THE MUNIFICENT PATRONS OF INDIAN LITERATURE,

THIS TRANSLATION OF A WORK,

WHICH IRREFRAGABLY DEMONSTRATES THE COMMON ORIGIN

OF THE

LANGUAGES OF INDIA AND OF EUROPE,

IS, WITH THEIR PERMISSION, RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

BY THEIR

MOST FAITHFUL AND OBEDIENT SERVANT,

THE TRANSLATOR.

PREFACE
TO THE
SECOND EDITION.

In giving to the Public this Second Edition of the English Translation of Bopp's great work on Comparative Grammar, it is right to state that the version has been approved by Professor Bopp himself, and that it has been again very carefully compared with the original; so that numerous errors, which, from the great length of the work were perhaps hardly to be avoided in a first edition, have now been corrected. The appearance of the original, too, in parts, and at considerable intervals of time, led to some inconsistencies in the translation in the mode of expressing the value of certain letters; but care has been taken to rectify this defect, also, in the present edition. The Table of Contents is altogether new, and will be found to be very much more copious than the German.

Those who wish for an Introductory Notice before commencing the study of the Grammar, or who mean to content themselves with a general notion of what has been achieved by the Author, may refer to the "Edinburgh Review," No. CXCII. p. 298, and the "Calcutta Review," No. XXIV. p. 468. It will be there seen that this Work has created a new epoch in the science of Comparative Philology, and that it may be justly assigned a place in that department of study corresponding to that of "Newton's Principia in Mathematics, Bacon's Novum Organum in Mental Science, or Blumenbach in Physiology." The encomiums of the Reviewer have in fact been justified by the adoption of the Work as a Lecture Book at Oxford, a by the extensive use which Rawlinson and other emine scholars have made of it in their researches.

It remains to be added, that while the Notes and Prefa made by Professor Wilson, the former Editor, have been r tained, I must be myself held responsible for the errors a defects, whatever they may be, of the present edition.

EDWARD B. EASTWIC

HAILEYBURY COLLEGE,
February, 1854.

PREFACE

TO THE

FIRST EDITION.

THE study of Comparative Philology has of late years been cultivated in Germany, especially, with remarkable ability and proportionate success. The labours of GRIMM, POTT, BOPP, and other distinguished Scholars, have given a new character to this department of literature; and have substituted for the vague conjectures suggested by external and often accidental coincidences, elementary principles, based upon the prevailing analogies of articulate sounds and the grammatical structure of language.

But although the fact that a material advance has been made in the study of Comparative Philology is generally known, and some of the particulars have been communicated to the English public through a few works on Classical Literature, or in the pages of periodical criticism; yet the full extent of the progress which has been effected, and the steps by which it has been attained, are imperfectly appreciated in this country. The study of the German language is yet far from being extensively pursued; and the results which the German Philologers have developed, and the reasonings which have led to them, being accessible to those only who can consult the original writers, are withheld from many individuals of education and learning to whom the affinities of cultivated speech are objects of interest and inquiry. Translations of the works, in which the information they would gladly seek for, is conveyed, are necessary to bring within their reach the materials that have been accumulated by German industry and erudition, for the illustration of the history of human speech.

Influenced by these considerations, Lord Francis Egerton was some time since induced to propose the translation of a work which occupies a prominent place in the literature of Comparative Philology on the Continent—the Vergleichende Grammatik of Professor Bopp of Berlin. In this work a new and remarkable class of affinities has been systematically and elaborately investigated. Taking as his standard the Sanskṛit language, Professor Bopp has traced the analogies which associate with it and with each other—the Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, and Sclavonic tongues: and whatever may be thought of some of his arguments, he may be considered to have established beyond reasonable question a near relationship between the languages of nations separated by the intervention of centuries, and the distance of half the globe, by differences of physical formation and social institutions,—between the forms of speech current among the dark-complexioned natives of India and the fair-skinned races of ancient and modern Europe;—a relationship of which no suspicion existed fifty years ago, and which has been satisfactorily established only within a recent period, during which the Sanskṛit language has been carefully studied, and the principles of alphabetical and syllabic modulation upon which its grammatical changes are founded, have been applied to its kindred forms of speech by the Philologers of Germany.

As the Vergleichende Grammatik of Professor Bopp is especially dedicated to a comprehensive comparison of languages, and exhibits, in some detail, the principles of the Sanskṛit as the ground-work and connecting bond of the comparison, it was regarded as likely to offer most interest to the Philologers of this countr [illegible] to be one of the most acceptable of its class to English students: it was therefore selected as the subject of translation. The execution of the work was, however, opposed by two considerations—the extent of the original, and the copiousness of the illustrations derived from the languages of the East, the Sanskṛit and the Zend. A complete translation demanded more time than was compatible with Lord F. EGERTON'S other occupations; and as he professed not a familiarity with Oriental Literature, he was reluctant to render himself responsible for the correctness with which the orientalisms of the text required to be represented. This difficulty was, perhaps, rather over-rated, as the Grammar itself supplies all the knowledge that is needed, and the examples drawn from the Sanskṛit and Zend speak for themselves as intelligibly as those derived from Gothic and Sclavonic. In order, however, that the publication might not be prevented by any embarrassment on this account, I offered my services in revising this portion of the work; and have hence the satisfaction of contributing, however humbly, to the execution of a task which I consider likely to give a beneficial impulse to the study of Comparative Philology in Great Britain.

The difficulty arising from the extent of the original work, and the consequent labour and time requisite for its translation, was of a more serious description. This, however, has been overcome by the ready co-operation of a gentleman, who adds a competent knowledge of German to eminent acquirements as an Oriental Scholar. Having mastered several of the spoken dialects of Western India, and made himself acquainted with the sacred language of the Parsees during the period of his service under the Presidency of Bombay, Lieutenant EASTWICK devoted part of a furlough, rendered necessary by failing health, to a residence in Germany, where he acquired the additional qualifications enabling him to take a share in the translation of the Vergleichende Grammatik. He has accordingly translated all those portions of the Comparative Grammar, the rendering of which was incompatible with the leisure of the Noble Lord with whom the design originated, who has borne a share in its execution, and who has taken a warm and liberal interest in its completion.

The Vergleichende Grammatik, originally published in separate Parts, has not yet reached its termination. In his first plan the author comprised the affinities of Sanskṛit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and its Teutonic descendants. To these, after the conclusion of the First Part, he added the Sclavonic. He has since extended his researches to the analogies of the Celtic and the Malay-Polynesian dialects, but has not yet incorporated the results with his general Grammar. The subjects already treated of are quite sufficient for the establishment of the principles of the comparison, and it is not proposed to follow him in his subsequent investigations. The first portions of the present Grammar comprise the doctrine of euphonic alphabetical changes, the comparative inflexions of Substantives and Adjectives, and the affinities of the Cardinal and Ordinal Numerals. The succeeding Parts contain the comparative formation and origin of the Pronouns and the Verbs: the latter subject is yet unfinished. The part of the translation now offered to the public stops with the chapter on the Numerals, but the remainder is completed, and will be published without delay.

With respect to the translation, I may venture to affirm, although pretending to a very slender acquaintance with German, that it has been made with great scrupulousness and care, and that it has required no ordinary pains to render in English, with fidelity and perspicuity, the not unfrequently difficult and obscure style of the original.

H. H. WILSON.

October, 1845.

PREFACE.

I CONTEMPLATE in this work a description of the comparative organization of the languages enumerated in the title page, comprehending all the features of their relationship, and an inquiry into their physical and mechanical laws, and the origin of the forms which distinguish their grammatical relations. One point alone I shall leave untouched, the secret of the roots, or the foundation of the nomenclature of the primary ideas. I shall not investigate, for example, why the root *i* signifies "go" and not "stand"; why the combination of sounds *stha* or *sta* signifies "stand" and not "go." I shall attempt, apart from this, to follow out as it were the language in its stages of being and march of development; yet in such a manner that those who are predetermined not to recognise, as explained, that which they maintain to be inexplicable, may perhaps find less to offend them in this work than the avowal of such a general plan might lead them to expect. In the majority of cases the primary signification, and, with it, the primary source of the grammatical forms, spontaneously present themselves to observation in consequence of the extension of our horizon of language, and of the confronting of sisters of the same lingual stock separated for ages, but bearing indubitable features of their family connection. In the treatment, indeed, of our European tongues a new epoch could not fail to open upon us in the discovery of another region in the world of language, namely, the Sanskṛit,[*] of which it has been demonstrated, that, in its grammatical constitution, it stands in the most intimate relation to the Greek, the Latin, the Germanic, &c.; so that it has afforded, for the first time, a firm foundation for the comprehension of the grammatical connection between the two languages called the Classical, as well as of the relation of these two to the German, the Lithuanian, and Sclavonic. Who could have dreamed a century ago that a language would be brought to us from the far East, which should accompany, *pari passû*, nay, sometimes surpass, the Greek in all those perfections of form which have been hitherto considered the exclusive property of the latter, and be adapted throughout to adjust the perennial strife between the Greek dialects, by enabling us to determine where each of them has preserved the purest and the oldest forms?

---

[*] *Sańskṛita* signifies "adorned, completed, perfect"; in respect to language, "*classic*"; and is thus adapted to denote the entire family or race." It is compounded of the elements *sam*, "with," and *kṛita* (nom. *kṛitas*, *kṛitâ*, *kṛitam*), "made," with the insertion of a euphonic *s* (§§. 18. 96.).

The relations of the ancient Indian languages to their European kindred are, in part, so palpable as to be obvious to every one who casts a glance at them, even from a distance: in part, however, so concealed, so deeply implicated in the most secret passages of the organization of the language, that we are compelled to consider every language subjected to a comparison with it, as also the language itself, from new stations of observation, and to employ the highest powers of grammatical science and method in order to recognise and illustrate the original unity of the different grammars. The Semitic languages are of a more compact nature, and, putting out of sight lexicographical and syntactical features, extremely meagre in contrivance; they had little to part with, and of necessity have handed down to succeeding ages what they were endowed with at starting. The triconsonantal fabric of their roots (§. 107.), which distinguishes this race from others, was already of itself sufficient to designate the parentage of every individual of the family. The family bond, on the other hand, which embraces the Indo-European race of languages, is not indeed less universal, but, in most of its bearings, of a quality infinitely more refined. The members of this race inherited, from the period of their earliest youth, endowments of exceeding richness, and, with the capability (§. 108.), the methods, also, of a system of unlimited composition and agglutination. Possessing much, they were able to bear the loss of much, and yet to retain their local life; and by multiplied losses, alterations, suppressions of sounds, conversions and displacements, the members of the common family are become scarcely recognisable to each other It is at least a fact, that the relation of the Greek to the Latin, the most obvious and palpable, though never quite overlooked, has been, down to our time, grossly misunderstood; and that the Roman tongue, which, in a grammatical point of view, is associated with nothing but itself, or with what is of its own family, is even now usually regarded as a mixed language, because, in fact, it contains much which sounds heterogeneous to the Greek, although the elements from which these forms arose are not foreign to the Greek and other sister languages, as I have endeavoured partly to demonstrate in my " System of Conjugation."*

The close relationship between the Classical and Germanic languages has, with the exception of mere comparative lists of words, copious indeed, but destitute of principle and critical judgment, remained, down to the period of the appearance of the Asiatic intermediary, almost entirely unobserved, although the acquaintance of philologists with the Gothic dates now from a century and a half; and that language is so perfect in its Grammar and so clear in its affinities, that had it been earlier submitted to a rigorous and systematic process of comparison and anatomical investigation, the pervading relation of itself, and, with it, of the entire Germanic stock, to the Greek and Roman, would necessarily have long since been unveiled, tracked through all its variations, and by this time been understood and recognised by every philologer.* For what is more important, or can be more earnestly desired by the cultivator of the classical languages, than their comparison with our mother tongue in her oldest and most perfect form? Since the Sanskṛit has appeared above our horizon, that element can no longer be excluded from a really profound investigation of any province of language related to it; a fact, however, which sometimes escapes the notice of the most approved and circumspect labourers in this department.† We need not fear that that practical and profound research in *utrâque linguâ*, which is of most importance to the philologer can suffer prejudice by extension over too many languages; for the variety vanishes when the real identity is recognised and explained, and the false light of discrepancy is excluded. It is one thing, also, to learn a language, another to teach one, *i.e.* to describe its mechanism and organization. The learner may confine himself within the narrowest limits, and forbear to look beyond the language to be studied: the teacher's glance, on the contrary, must pass beyond the confined limits of one or two members of a family, and he must summon around him the representatives of the entire race, in order to infuse life, order, and organic mutual dependency into the mass of the languages spread before him. To attempt this appears to me the main requirement of the present period, and past centuries have been accumulating materials for the task.

---

* Frankfort. a. M. 1816. A translation of my English revision of this treatise (" Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Teutonic Languages," in the "Annals of Oriental Literature," London 1820.) by Dr. Pacht is to be found in the second and third number of the second annual issue of Seebode's new Record of Philology and Pædagogical science. Grimm's masterly German Grammar was unfortunately unknown to me when I wrote the English revision, and I could then make use only of Hickes and Fulda for the old German dialects.

---

* Rask has been the first to supply a comprehensive view of the close relationship between the Germanic and the Classical Languages, in his meritorious prize treatise "On the Thracian Tribe of Languages," completed in 1814 and published in 1818, from which Vater gives an extract in his Comparative Tables. It cannot be alleged as a reproach against him that he did not profit by the Asiatic intermediary not then extensively known; but his deficiency in this respect shews itself the more sensibly, as we see throughout that he was in a condition to use it with intelligence. Under that deficiency, however, he almost everywhere halts halfway towards the truth. We have to thank him for the suggestion of the law of displacement of consonants, more acutely considered and fundamentally developed by Grimm (§. 87., and see Vater, §. 12.).

† We refer the reader to the very weighty judgment of W. von. Humboldt on the indispensable necessity of the Sanskṛit for the history and philosophy of language (Indische Bibl. I. 133). We may here borrow, also, from Grimm's preface to the second edition of his admirable Grammar, some words which are worthy of consideration (I. vi.): "As the too exalted position of the Latin and Greek serves not for all questions in German Grammar, where some words are of simpler and deeper sound, so however, according to A. W. Schlegel's excellent remark, the far more perfect Indian Grammar may, in these cases, supply the requisite corrections. The dialect which history demonstrates to be the oldest and least corrupted must, in the end, present the most profound rules for the general exposition of the race, and thus lead us on to the reformation, without the entire subversion of the rules hitherto discovered, of the more recent modes of speech."

The Zend Grammar could only be recovered by the process of a severe regular etymology, calculated to bring back the unknown to the known, the much to the little; for this remarkable language, which in many respects reaches beyond, and is an improvement on, the Sanskṛit, and makes its theory more attainable, would appear to be no longer intelligible to the disciples of Zoroaster. Rask, who had the opportunity to satisfy himself on this head, says expressly (V. d. Hagen, p. 33) that its forgotten lore has yet to be rediscovered. I am also able, I believe, to demonstrate that the Pehlvi translator (tom. II. pp. 476, et seq.) of the Zend Vocabulary, edited by Anquetil, has frequently and entirely failed in conveying the grammatical sense of the Zend words which he translates. The work abounds with singular mistakes; and the distorted relation of Anquetil's French translation to the Zend expressions is usually to be ascribed to the mistakes in the Pehlvi interpretations of the Zend original. Almost all the oblique cases, by degrees, come to take rank as nominatives; the numbers, too, are sometimes mistaken. Further, we find forms of cases produced by the Pehlvi translator as verbal persons, and next these also confounded with each other, or translated by abstract nouns.* Anquetil makes, as far as I know, no

---

* I give the Zend expressions according to the system of representation explained in §. 30., annexing the original characters, which are exhibited in type for the first time in this book, and which were lately cut at the order of the Royal Society of Literature by R. Gotzig, according to the exemplar of the lithographed M. S. of M. Burnouf. I give the Pehlvi words exactly according to Anquetil (II. 435.): *ahmâkĕm*, "*ἡμῶν*," P. *rouman* (cf. p. 502, *roman*, "*nos*"), A. "*je*," "*moi*;" *ahubya*, "*bonis*" (with dual termination, §. 215.), P. *avaéh*, A. "*bon*," "*excellent*;" *aêtê*, "*hi*," "*ii*," P. *varman*, "*is*," A. "*lui*;" *aṅhĕm*, "I was," or also "I am," P. *djanounad*, "he is," A. "*il est*;" *aṅheus*, "*mundi*," P. *akhé*, A. "*le monde*;" *avaêshaṅm*, "*horum*," P. *varmouschan*, "*ii*," A. "*eux*;" *baraiti*, "*fert*," P. *dadrouneschné*, "the carrying" (*eschné*, in Pehlvi, forms abstract substantives), A. "*il porte*," "*il execute*," "*porter*;" *bîs*, "twice," P. *dou*, "two," A. "*deux*;" *bérétebïô* (*baratibyô*, "*ferentibus?*" unquestionably a plural dative and ablative), P. *dadrouneschné*, "the carrying," A. "*porter*;" *tê*, "*tui*," P. *tou*, "*tu*," A. "*toi*;" *tâcha*, "*eaque*" (neut. §. 231.), P. *zakedj*, A. "*ce*;" *jatô*, "the smitten" (cf. Sansk. *hatas* from *han*), P. *maitouned*, "he smites," A. "*il frappe*;" *janat*, "he smote," P. *maitouneschné*, "the smiting," A. "*frapper*;" *zaṅthra*, "*per genitorem*," P. *zarhounad*, "*gignit*," A. "*il engendre*;" *śtrî*, "*femina*," P. *vakad*, A. "*femelle*;" *śtrîm*, "*feminam*," P. *vakad*, A. "*femelle*;" *śtâraṅm*, "*stellarum*," P. *setaran*, A. "*les étoiles*;" *fra-dâtâi*, "to the given," or "especially given," P. *feraz dcheschné* (*nomen actionis*), A. "*donner abondamment*;" *gaêthanaṅm*, "*mundorum*," P. *guehan* (cf. جهان), A. "*le monde*;" *gâtûmcha*, "*locumque*," P. *gâh*, A. "*lieu*;" *nars*, "of the man," P. *guebna hamat advak*, A. "*un homme*;" *nara*, "two men," P. *guebna hamat dou*, A. "*deux hommes*;" *nâirikanaṅm*, "*feminarum*," P. *nairik hamat sé*, A. "*trois (ou plusieurs) femmes*;" *thryaṅm*, "*trium*," P. *sevin*, A. "*troisième*;" *vahmĕmcha*, "*præclarumque*," P. *néaeschné*, "*adoratio*," A. "*je fais néaesch*;" *vahmâi*, "*præclaro*," P. *néaesch*, *konam*, "*adorationem facio*," A. "*je bénis*

et

remark on the age of the Vocabulary to which I advert; while he ascribes to another, in which the Pehlvi is interpreted through the Persian, an antiquity of four centuries. The

---

et fais néuesch." I do not insist on translating the adjective 𐬬𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬀 *vahma* by "*præclarus*," but I am certain of this, that *vahmĕm* and *vahmâi* are nothing else than the accusative and dative of the base *vahma*; and that 𐬬𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬁𐬌 *vahmâi* could be the first person of a verb is not to be thought possible for a moment. Anquetil, however, in the interlinear version of the beginning of the V. S. attempted by him, gives two other evident datives compounded with the particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, "and," as the first person singular of the present, viz. 𐬑𐬴𐬥𐬀𐬊𐬚𐬭𐬁𐬌𐬗𐬀 *csnaothrâi-cha*, 𐬟𐬭𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀𐬌𐬀𐬉𐬗𐬀 *fraśaśtayaê-cha* (see §. 164.), by "*placere cupio*," "*vota facio*." One then sees, from the examples here adduced, the number of which I could with ease greatly increase, that the Pehlvi Translator of the said Vocabulary has, no more than Anquetil, any grammatical acquaintance with the Zend language, and that both regarded it rather in the light of an idiom, poor in inflexions; so that, as in Pehlvi and Modern Persian, the grammatical power of the members of a sentence would be to be gathered rather from their position than from their terminations. And Anquetil expressly says (II. 415.): "*La construction dans la langue Zende, semblable en cela aux autres idiômes de l'Orient, est astreinte à peu de regles* (!). *La formation des tems des Verbes y est à peu près la même que dans le Persan, plus trainante cependant, parce qu'elle est accompagnée de toutes les voyelles* (!). How stands it, then, with the Sanskrit translation of the Jzeschne made from the Pehlvi more than three centuries before that of Anquetil. This question will, without doubt, be very soon answered by M. E. Burnouf, who has already supplied, and admirably illustrated (Nouv. Journ. Asiat., T. III. p. 321), two passages from the work in a very interesting extract from its Commentary on the V. S. These passages are, however, too short to permit of our grounding on them over-bold inferences as to the whole; moreover, their contents are of such a nature that the inflexionless Pehlvi language could follow the Zend original almost verbatim. The one passage signifies, "I call upon, I magnify the excellent pure spell, and the excellent man, the pure and the strict, strong like Dámi (? cf. Sansk. *upamâna*, "similarity;" and V. S., p. 423, *dâmôis drujô*) Izet." It is, however, very surprising, and of evil omen, that Neriosengh, or his Pehlvi predecessor, takes the feminine genitive *dahmayâs* as a plural genitive, since this expression is evidently, as Burnouf rightly remarks, only an epithet of *âfritôis*. I abstain from speaking of the dubious expressions *dâmôis upamanahê*, and content my-

self

one in question cannot therefore be ascribed to any very late period. The necessity, indeed, of interpretation for the Zend must have been felt much sooner than for the Pehlvi, which remained much longer current among the Parsee tribes. It was therefore an admirable problem which had for its solution the bringing to light, in India, and, so to say, under the very eye of the Sanskṛit, a sister language, no longer understood, and obscured by the rubbish of ages;—a problem of which the solution indeed has not hitherto been fully obtained, but beyond doubt will be. The first contribution to the knowledge of this language which can be relied on—that of Rask—namely, his treatise "On the age and authenticity of the Zend Language and the Zend-Avesta," published in 1826, and made generally accessible by V. d. Hagen's translation, deserves high honour as a first attempt. The Zend has to thank this able man (whose premature death we deeply deplore) for the more natural appearance which it has derived from his rectification of the value of its written characters. Of three words of different declensions he gives us the singular inflections, though with some sensible deficiencies, and those, too, just in the places where the Zend forms are of most interest, and where are some which display that independence of the Sanskṛit which Rask claims, perhaps in too high a degree, for the Zend; a language we are, however, unwilling to receive as a mere dialect of the Sanskṛit, and to which we are compelled to ascribe an independent existence, resembling that of the Latin as compared with the Greek, or the Old Northern with the Gothic. For the rest, I refer the reader to my review of Rask's and Bohlen's treatises on the Zend in the Annual of Scientific Criticism for December 1831, as also to an earlier work (March 1831) on the able labours of E. Burnouf in this newly-

---

self with having pointed out the possibility of another view of the construction, different from that which has been very profoundly discussed by Burnouf, and which is based on Neriosengh. The second passage signifies, "I call upon and magnify the stars, the moon, the sun, the eternal, self-created lights!"

opened field. My observations, derived from the original texts edited by Burnouf in Paris, and by Olshausen in Hamburgh, already extend themselves, in these publications, over all parts of the Zend Grammar; and nothing therefore has remained for me here, but further to establish, to complete, and to adjust the particulars in such a manner that the reader may be conducted on a course parallel with that of the known languages, with the greatest facility towards an acquaintance with the newly-discovered sister tongue. In order to obviate the difficulty and the labour which attend the introduction of the learner to the Zend and Sanskṛit—difficulty sufficient to deter many, and to harass any one—I have appended to the original characters the pronunciation, laid down on a consistent method, or in places where, for reasons of space, one character alone is given, it is the Roman. This method is also perhaps the best for the gradual introduction of the reader to the knowledge of the original characters.

As in this work the languages it embraces are treated for their own sakes, *i. e.* as objects and not means of knowledge, and as I aim rather at giving a physiology of them than an introduction to their practical use, it has been in my power to omit many particulars which contribute nothing to the character of the whole; and I have gained thereby more space for the discussion of matters more important, and more intimately incorporated with the vital spirit of the language. By this process, and by the strict observance of a method which brings under one view all points mutually dependent and mutually explanatory, I have, as I flatter myself, succeeded in assembling under one group, and in a reasonable space, the leading incidents of many richly-endowed languages or grand dialects of an extinct original stock. Special care has been bestowed throughout on the German. This care was indispensable to one who, following Grimm's admirable work, aimed at applying to it the correction and adjustment that had become necessary in his theory of relations, the discovery of new affinities, or the more precise definition of those discovered, and to catch, with greater truth, at every step of grammatical progress, the monitory voices of the Asiatic as well as the European sisterhood. It was necessary, also, to set aside many false appearances of affinity; as, for example, to deprive the *i* in the Lithuanian *geri* of its supposed connection with the *i* of Gothic, Greek, and Latin forms, such as *gôdai*, *ἀγαθοι*, *boni* (see p. 251, Note †, and compare Grimm I. 827. 11); and to disconnect the Latin *is* of *lupis* (*lupibus*) from the Greek *ις* of *λύκοις* (*λύκοι-σι*). As concerns the method followed in treating the subject of Germanic grammar, it is that of deducing all from the Gothic as the guiding star of the German, and explaining the latter simultaneously with the older languages and the Lithuanian. At the close of each lecture on the cases, a tabular view is given of the results obtained, in which every thing naturally depends on the most accurate distinction of the terminations from the base, which ought not, as usually happens, to be put forward capriciously, so that a portion of the base is drawn into the inflection, by which the division becomes not merely useless, but injurious, as productive of positive error. Where there is no real termination none should be appended for appearance sake: thus, for example, we give, §. 148, p. 164, the nominatives *χώρα*, *terra*, *giba*, &c., as without inflection cf. §. 137. The division *gib-a* would lead us to adopt the erroneous notion that *a* is the termination, whereas it is only the abbreviation of the *ô* (from the old *â*, §. 69.) of the theme.* In certain instances it is extraordinarily difficult in languages not now thoroughly understood to hit on the right divisions, and to distinguish apparent terminations from true. I have never attempted to conceal these difficulties from the reader, but always to remove them from his path.

---

* The simple maxim laid down elsewhere by me, and deducible only from the Sanskrit, that the Gothic *ô* is the long of *a*, and thereby when shortened nothing but *a*, as the latter lengthened can only become *ô*, extends its influence over the whole grammar and construction of words, and explains, for example, how from *dags*, "day" (theme *DAGA*), may be derived, without change of vowel, *dôgs* (*DŌGA*), "daily"; for this derivation is absolutely the same as when in Sanskrit *râjata*, "*argenteus*," comes from *răjata*, "*argentum*," on which more hereafter. Generally speaking, and with few exceptions, the Indian system of vowels, pure from consonantal and other altering influences, is of extraordinary importance for the elucidation of the German grammar: on it principally rests my own theory of vowel change, which differs materially from that of Grimm, and which I explain by mechanical laws, with some modifications of my earlier definitions,

The High German, especially in its oldest period (from the eighth to the eleventh century), I have only mentioned in the general description of forms when it contributes something of importance. The juxta-position of it in its three main periods with the Gothic, grammatically explained at the close of each chapter, is sufficient, with a reference also to the treatise on sounds intended to prepare and facilitate my whole Grammar, after the model of my Sanskṛit Grammar. Wherever, in addition, explanatory remarks are necessary, they are given. The second part will thus begin with the comparative view of the Germanic declensions, and I shall then proceed to the adjectives, in order to describe their formations of gender and degrees of comparison; from these to the pronouns.

As the peculiarities of inflection of the latter must have, for the most part, already been discussed in the doctrine of the universal formation of the cases, inasmuch as they are intimately connected and mutually illustrative, what will remain to be said on their behalf will claim the less space, and the main compass of the second division will remain for the verb. To the formation and comparison of words it is my intention to devote a separate work, which may be considered as a completion of its antecedent. In this latter the particles, conjunctions, and original prepositions, will find their place, being, I consider, partly offshoots of pronominal roots, and partly naked roots of

---

tions, while with Grimm it has a dynamic signification. A comparison with the Greek and Latin vocalism, without a steady reference to the Sanskṛit, is, in my opinion, for the German more confusing than enlightening, as the Gothic is generally more original in its vocal system, and at least more consistent than the Greek and Latin, which latter spends its whole wealth of vowels, although not without pervading rules, in merely responding to a solitary Indian *a* (*septimus* for *septamas*, *quatuor* for *chatvâr-as* *τέσσαρ-ες*, *momordi* for *mamarda*).

this class of words,* and which will, therefore, be treated in this point of view among the pronominal adjectives.† It is likely that a chasm in our literature, very prejudicial to inquiries of this kind, may be shortly filled up by a work ready for the press, and earnestly looked for by all friends of German and general philology, the Old High German Treasury of Graff. What we may expect from a work founded on a comprehensive examination of the MS. treasures of libraries national and foreign, as well as on a correction of printed materials, may be gathered from a survey of the amount contributed to knowledge in a specimen of the work, small, but happily selected, "The Old High German Prepositions."

---

* I refer the reader preliminarily to my two last treatises (Berlin, Ferd. Dümmler) "On Certain Demonstrative Bases, and their connection with various Prepositions and Conjunctions," and "On the Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words." Compare, also, C. Gottl. Schmidt's excellent tract "Quæst. Gramm. de Præpositionibus Græcis," and the review of the same, distinguished by acute observations, by A. Benary, in the Berlin Annual (May 1830). If we take the adverbs of place in their relation to the prepositions—and a near relation does exist—we shall find in close connection with the subject a remarkable treatise of the minister W. von Humboldt, "On the Affinity of the Adverbs of Place to the Prepositions in certain Languages." The Zend has many grammatical rules which were established without these discoveries, and have since been demonstrated by evidence of facts. Among them it was a satisfaction to me to find a word, used in Sanskṛit only as a preposition (*ava*, "from,") in the Zend a perfect and declinable pronoun (§. 172.). Next we find *sa-cha*, "*isque*," which in Sanskrit is only a pronoun, in its Zend shape 𐬵𐬀𐬗𐬀 *ha-cha* (§. 53.), often used as a preposition to signify "out of"; the particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, "and," loses itself, like the cognate *que* in *absque*, in the general signification.

"Remark.—What in §. 68. is said of the rise of the *u* or *o* out of the older *a* is so far to be corrected according to my later conviction, that nothing but a retroactive influence is to be ascribed to the liquids; and the *u* and the *o*, in forms like *plintemu* (*mo*), *plintyu*, are to be exempted from the influence of the antecedent consonants."

† The arrangement thus announced, as intended, has undergone, as will be seen, considerable modification.—*Editor*.

F. BOPP.

BERLIN, 1833.

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

Sanskṛit writing distinguishes the long from their corresponding short vowels by particular characters, slightly differing from these latter in form. We distinguish the long vowels, and the diphthongs ए *e* and ओ *o*, which spring from *i* and *u* united with an antecedent *a*, by a circumflex. The simple vowels are, first, the three, original and common to all languages, *a, i, u*, short and long; secondly, a vowel *r*, peculiar to the Sanskṛit, which I distinguish by *ṛ*, and its long sound by *ṝ*. The short *ṛ* (ऋ) is pronounced like the consonant *r* with a scarcely-distinguishable *i*, and in European texts is usually written *rĭ*; the long *ṝ* (ॠ) is scarcely to be distinguished from the union of an *r* with a long *i*. Both vowels appear to me to be of later origin; and *ṛ* presents itself generally as a shortening of the syllable *ar* by suppression of the *a*, The long *ṝ* (ॠ) is of much rarer occurrence. In declension it stands only for a lengthening of the *ṛ*, where, according to the laws of the formation of cases, a short vowel at the end of the inflective base must be lengthened; and in the conjugation and formation of words, those roots to which grammarians assign a terminating ॠ *ṝ* almost always substitute for this unoriginal vowel अर् *ar*, इर् *ir*, ईर् *îr*, or, after labials, ऊर् *ûr*. The last simple vowel of the Sanskṛit writing belongs more to the grammarians [G. Ed. p. 2.] than to the language: it is in character, as well as in pronunciation, an union of an ल् *l* with ऋ *ṛ* (ऌ), or, when lengthened, with ॠ *ṝ* (ॡ). We require no representative for this vowel, and shall not further advert to it.

2. Sanskṛit possesses two kinds of diphthongs. In the one,

a short *a* united with a following *i* becomes ए *ê* (equivalent to the French *ai*), and with *u* becomes ओ *ô* (equivalent to the French *au*); so that neither of the united elements is heard, but both melt into a third sound. In the second kind, a long *â* with a following *i* becomes ऐ *ai*, and with *u*, औ *au*, as in the German words *waise, baum;* so that the two elements form indeed one syllable, but are both audible. In order, however, to fix the observation on the greater weight of the *a* in this diphthong, we write *âi* for ऐ, and *âu* for औ. That in ए *ê* and ओ *ô* a short, in ऐ *âi* and औ *âu*, a long *a* is bound up, I infer from this, that where, in order to avoid a hiatus, the last element of a diphthong merges into its corresponding semi-vowel, out of ए *ê* and ओ *ô* proceed the sounds अय् *ay* and अव् *av* (with short *a*), but out of ऐ *âi* and औ *âu* proceed *ây* and *âv*. If, according to the rules of combination, a concluding आ *â*, with an इ *i*, ई *î*, or उ *u*, ऊ *û* of a following word, be contracted, like the short *a*, into ए *ê* and ओ *ô*, but not into ऐ *âi* and औ *âu*, this, in my view, is to be understood as if the long *a*, before its combination with the initial vowel of the following word, had shortened itself. This should the less surprise us, as the long *a* before a dissimilar vowel of an appended inflexion or a suffix entirely disappears; and, for example, ददा *dadâ* with उस् *us* makes neither ददौस् *dadâus*, nor ददोस् *dadôs*, but ददुस् *dadus*. The opinion I have already expressed on
[G. Ed. p. 3.] this point I have since found confirmed by the Zend; in which 𐬁𐬌 *âi* always stands in the place of the Sanskrit ऐ *âi*, and 𐬁𐬊 *âo* or 𐬁𐬎 *âu* for औ *âu*. In support, also, of my theory, appears the fact, that a concluding *a* (short or long) with a following ए *ê* or ओ *ô*, becomes ऐ *âi* and औ *âu;* of which it is to be understood, that the short *a* contained in *ê* and *ô* merges with the antecedent *a* into a long *a*, which then, with the *i* of the diphthong *ê*, becomes *âi*, and with the *u* of *ô*, becomes *âu*. For example, ममैतत् *mamâitat*, from मम एतत् *mama êtat*, is to be understood

as if the diphthong ए *ê* united its first element *a* with the preceding *a* into *â*, and with this, further united its last element (*i*) into ऐ *âi*.

3. Among the simple vowels the old Indian alphabet is deficient in the designation of the Greek epsilon and omicron (ε and ο), whose sounds, if they existed when the Sanskṛit was a living language, yet could only have evolved themselves, subsequently to the fixing of its written character, out of the short *a*; for an alphabet which lends itself to the subtlest gradations of sound would assuredly not have neglected the difference between *ă*, *ĕ*, and *ŏ*, if the sounds had been forthcoming.* It is important here to observe, that in the oldest Germanic dialect, namely, the Gothic, the sounds and characters of the short *e* and *o* are also wanting, and that either *a*, *i*, or *u* corresponds, in that dialect, to our German short *e*. For example, *faltha*, "ich falte," "I fold;" *giba*, "ich gebe," "I give." In the Zend the Sanskṛit अ *a* remains usually 𐬀 *a*, or has changed itself, according to certain [G. Ed. p. 4.] rules, into 𐬆 *ĕ*. Thus, for example, before a concluding *m* we always find 𐬆 *ĕ*; compare the accusative 𐬞𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬆𐬨 *puthrĕ-m* "filium" with पुत्रम् *putra-m*; and its genitive 𐬞𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬉 *puthra-hê* with पुत्रस्य *putra-sya*. In Greek the Sanskṛit अ *a* becomes ᾰ, ε, or ο, without presenting any certain rules for the choice on each occasion between these three vowels; but the prevailing practice is, that in the terminations of nominal bases the Greek ο answers to the Indian अ *a*, except in the vocatives, where an ε is substituted. In the Latin, besides *ă*, *ĕ*, and *ŏ*, *u* also is employed, in the terminations of nouns of the second declension and of the first person plural, as also in some adverbial suffixes, to replace the Sanskṛit अ *a*.

4. As in the Greek the short Sanskṛit *a* is oftener replaced by ε or ο than by a short *a*, so the long आ *â* is oftener re-

---

* Grimm, Vol. i. p. 594; with whom I entirely concur in this matter; having long abandoned a contrary opinion, which I maintained in 1819 in the Annals of Oriental Literature.

presented by *η* or *ω* than by a long alpha: and though in the Doric the long *α* has maintained itself in places where the ordinary dialect employs an *η*, no similar trace of the long *ā* for *ω* is to be found. दधामि *dadhâmi* "I place," becomes *τίθημι*; ददामि *dadâmi*, "I give," *δίδωμι*; the dual termination ताम् *tâm* answers to *την*, and only in the imperative to *των*: on the other hand, the आम् *âm* of the genitive plural is always represented by *ων*. Never, if we except peculiarities of dialect, does either *η* or *ω* stand for the Indian diphthongs ए *ê* or ओ *ô*, formed by इ *i* or an उ *u* following a long *â*: for the first, the Greek substitutes *ει* or *οι* (because for अ *a*, and also for *α*, *ε* and *ο* are the substitutes), and for the last, *ευ* or *ου*. Thus, एमि *êmi*, "I go," becomes *εἶμι*; पतेस् *patês*, "thou mayest fall," *πίπτοις*; वेद *vêda*, "I know," *οἶδα*; गो *go*, mas. fem. "a bullock or heifer," *βοῦ-ς*. From this dropping of the *i* or *u* in the Indian diphthongs *ê* and *ô* it [G. Ed. p. 5.] may happen that *α*, *ε*, or *ο*, answer to these diphthongs; thus, एकतरस् *êkataras*, "one of two," becomes *ἑκάτερος*; देवृ *dêvṛi*,* "brother-in-law," Latin, *levir* (nom. देवा *dêvâ*, accus. देवरम् *devar-am*), becomes *δαήρ* (from *δαϝήρ*, *δαιϝήρ*); देवस् *dêva-s*, "God," *Θεός*; and the *ο* in *βοός*, *βοΐ*, stands for *βου-ός*, *βου-ί*, the *u* of which must have passed into *ϝ*, and certainly did so at first, as is proved by the transition into the Latin *bovis*, *bovi*, and the Indian गवि *gavi* (locative) from *gô-i*.

5. In Latin we sometimes find the long *e*, which, however, may be shortened by the influence of the following consonant, arising from the mixture of *a* and *i*, as in the abovementioned word *lêvir*, and in the subjunctive *amêmus* cf. कामयेम *kâmayêma* from *kâmaya-îma*.

6. If we inquire after the greater or less relative weight of the vowels of different quality, I have discovered, by

---

* The original has *devṛ*, but, as observed in p. 1, in European texts it is usual to write *ṛi* for ऋ; and the absence of any sign for the vowel sound is calculated to cause embarrassment: it seems advisable, therefore, to express ऋ by *ṛi*.—*Editor*.

various but sure appearances, which I shall further illustrate in my treatise on Forms, that in Sanskṛit अ *a* and आ *á* are graver than the corresponding quantity of the vowel *i*; and this discovery is of the utmost importance for every Treatise on special as well as comparative Grammar. It leads us, in particular, to important discoveries with respect to the Germanic modification of vowels. In Latin, also, the *i* may be considered as lighter than *a*, and generally takes the place of the latter when a root with an original *a* would otherwise be burthened with a reduplication of sound. Hence, for example, *abjicio* for *abjacio, tetigi* for *tetagi*. I am compelled by this view to retract an earlier conjecture, that the *i* in *tetigi* was produced by a virtue of assimilation in the termination *i*. I have also to relieve myself from my former theory, that the *e* in words like *inermis, imberbis,* instead of [G. Ed. p. 6.] *inarmis, imbarbis,* springs from a retrospective power of assimilation in the following *i*, after the fashion of the modification of the vowel in German (Grimm, p. 80), and must place it in the same class with the *e* in such forms as *abjectus* and *tubicen*. The Latin radical *a*, for instance, is subject to a double alteration, when the root is burthened with antecedent syllables or words: it becomes *i* in open syllables, but *e* if the vowel is pressed upon by a following consonant unattended by a vowel. Hence we have *tubicen, abjectus,* in contrast to *tubicinis, abjicio;* and *inermis, imberbis,* not *inirmis, imbirbis*: on the contrary, *inimicus, insipidus,* not *inemicus, insepidus*. In connection with this stands the transition of the first or second declension into the third. As *us* is the masculine form for *a*, we ought to say *inermus, imberbus;* but *inermis, imberbis,* and other such forms, owe their origin to the lesser weight of the *i*. With the displacement of the accent, where it occurs, this change of the vowel has nothing to do; but the removal of the accent and the weakening of the vowel are nearly related, and are both occasioned by the composition. In the Lithuanian we find similar appearances; as, for example, *pónas* "lord," at the end of compounds, is weakened into *ponis*, as *rótponis*, "councillor," Germ. *rathsherr*."

7. Sanskṛit Grammar gives no certain indication of the relative weight of the *u* with regard to the other original vowels. The *u* is a vowel too decided and full of character to allow of its being exchanged in this language, in relief of its weight, for any other letter. It is the most obstinate of all, and admits of no exclusion from a terminating syllable, in cases where *a* and *i* admit suppression. Nor will it retire [G. Ed. p. 7.] from a reduplicated syllable in cases where *a* allows itself to be weakened down to *i*. Thus in Latin we have *pupugi, tutudi*; while *a*, in cases of repetition, is reduced to *i* or *ĕ* (*tĕtigi, fefelli*, &c.) In the Gothic, also, the *u* may boast of its pertinacity: it remains firm as the terminating vowel of nominal bases where *a* and *i* have undergone suppression, and in no single case has it been extinguished or transmuted. No power, however, exists which will not yield at last to time; and thus in the High German, whose oldest records are nearly four centuries younger than Ulphilas, the *u* has, in many cases, given way, or become in declension similar to *i*.

8. If, in the matter of the relative dignity of the vowels, we cast a glance at another race of languages, we find in Arabic the *u* taking precedence in nobility, as having its place in the nominative, while the declension is governed by the change of the terminating vowel; *i*, on the contrary, shews itself to be the weakest vowel, by having its place in the genitive, the most dependent case of the Arabic, and one which cannot be separated from the governing word. *I*, also, is continually used in cases where the grammatical relation is expressed by a preposition. Compare, also, in the plural, the *ûna* of the nominative with the termination *îna* of the oblique cases. *A* stands between the strong *u* and the weaker *i*; and under the threefold change of vowels has its place in the accusative, which admits of more freedom than the genitive. In the

oblique cases, however, of nouns, and in the two-fold change of vowels, it stands opposed to the *u* of the nominative, and in the dependent subjunctive of the verb to the *u* of the independent indicative.

9. Between the vowels and the consonants, or at the close of the list of vowels, are commonly placed two signs, the sounds of which are rather to be considered as ap- [G. Ed. p. 8.] pendages to, or modifications of, the preceding vowels, than as independent sounds, and take, also, no place in the alphabet of the Native Grammarians, inasmuch as they are considered neither as consonants nor vowels, but rather as complements to the latter. The first, which we distinguish by *ṅ*, is called *Anuswâra*, "echo;" and is, in fact, a thick nasal echo, which I think is best represented by the nasal *n* at the end of a French syllable. The weakness of its expression is discernible in the fact that it does not, like a consonant, impede the euphonic influence of an *i* or *u* on a following *s*, (see Sanskṛit Grammar, R. 101^a). It has its place before semi-vowels (य् *y*, र् *r*, ऌ् *l*, व् *v*), sibilants, and *h;* and we might thence term it the nasal of the two last lists of consonants, and assign its alphabetical place between them. A concluding म *m*, followed by a consonant of the said two lists, passes into Anuswâra; for example, तस्याम् *tasyâm*, "in this," becomes तस्यां *tasyâṅ*, with the French nasal pronunciation of the *n*, if such a word as रात्रौ *râtrâu*, "in the night," come after. In connection with the स् *s* of a verbal termination, a radical न् *n* also passes into Anuswâra; as, हंसि *haṅsi*, "thou killest," from हन् *han*. Great confusion, however, has arisen from the circumstance that the Indian copyists allow themselves to express the unaltered concluding म् *m*, as well as all the nasal alterations, and, in the middle of words, each of the six nasal sounds (the proper Anuswâra included), by Anuswâra.* I have

---

* The practice is not unauthorized by rule. A final म् is convertible to Anuswâra before *any* consonant (Pán. 8. 3. 23.); and a medial न or म is convertible

endeavoured, in my Grammar, to remedy this confusion in the simple theory of Anuswâra. My predecessors in the treatment of Sanskṛit Grammar make no distinction between the real and the supposititious Anuswâra. Colebrooke gives it, in [G. Ed. p. 9.] general, the pronunciation of *n*, and calls it "a shortening of the nasal consonants at the end of a syllable," which leads to the error, that each of the nasal characters, even the concluding न् *n*, may be abbreviated into Anuswâra. Forster expresses it by the *n* in the English word *plinth;* Carey and Yates by the English combination *ng;* Wilkins by *m*. All substitute it for the concluding म् of grammatical terminations: and as they give rules for the transition of the Anuswâra into म् or न्, the necessary consequence occurs, that we must write *abhavan* or *abhavang*, "I was;" *dantan* or *dantang*, "a tooth;" not *abhavam*, *dantam*. Colebrooke, on the other hand, expressing a Sanskṛit inscription in Roman letters (Asiatic Transactions, Vol. VII.) gives the proper termination *m*, and before *t*, by a euphonic rule, *n*; but he maintains the original *m* before sibilants and half vowels where Anuswâra is due; as *vidwishâm śrîmad*, for विद्विषां *vidwishâṅ*. On the other hand, F. von Schlegel and Frank write *n*, for the value of Anuswâra, in the place of *m* in several grammatical terminations. The first, for example, gives *danan*, "a gift," for *dânam;* the second, *ahan* for *aham*, "I." A. W. von Schlegel gives rightly *m* instead of a spurious or representative Anuswâra at the end of words; and makes, for example, the infinitive termination in *tum*, not in *tun* or *tung*. He nevertheless, on this important point of grammar, retains the erroneous opinion, that the Anuswâra is a variable nasal, which, before vowels, must of necessity pass into *m* (Preface to the Bhag. Gita, p. xv.); while the direct converse is the fact, that the concluding *m* is

---

convertible to Anuswâra before any consonant except a semi-vowel or a nasal. (Ib. 8. 3. 24.) Such are the rules. In practice, the mutation of the final म् is constant: that of the medial nasal is more variable, and in general the change occurs before the semi-vowels and sibilants.—*Editor.*

the variable nasal, which, under certain conditions, passes into the proper Anuswâra; but before vowels is necessarily retained, both in writing and pronunciation. [G. Ed. p. 10.] That Von Schlegel also still continues the original म् *m* at the end of words as an euphonic alteration of the dead sound of Anuswâra appears from his mode of printing Sanskṛit text, in which he makes no division between a concluding म् *m* and the commencing vowel of the following word; while he does make a division after न् *n*, and thereby shews that he admits a division after terminating letters which remain unaffected by the influence of the letters which follow. If, however, we write तान् अब्रवीत् *tân abravît*, "he said to them," we must also write ताम् अब्रवीत् *tâm abravît*, "he said to her;" not तामब्रवीत् *tâmabravît*, for the म of ताम् *tâm* is original, and not, as Von Schlegel thinks, begotten out of Anuswâra. The conjecture of C. Lassen (Ind. Bibl. Book III. p. 39), that the Anuswâra is to be understood, not as an after sound (*Nachlaut*), nor as an echo (*Nachhall*), but as a sound which regulates itself by that which follows—as it were the term *Nachlaut*, with the accent on *laut**—appears to me highly improbable. Schlegel's *nasalis mutabilis* would indeed be justified by this view, and the imputation of error removed from the Indian Grammarians, to whom we willingly concede a knowledge of the value of the Sanskṛit signs of sound, and whom we are unwilling to censure for designating a half sound as mutable, in a language whose terminating sounds are almost always governed by the following words. It is true the half sound owes its being to the mutability of a concluding *m*, but is not mutable itself, since it never has an independent existence of its own at the end of any word: in the middle, however, of a radical syllable, as दंश् *daṅś*, हिंस् *hiṅs*, it is susceptible of expulsion, but not of alteration.

---

* This seems intended for an explanation, for Lassen has nothing like it. I have not found an etymological explanation of the term in any grammatical commentary; but it may be doubted if the explanation of the text, or that given by Lassen, be correct. Anuswâra may indeed be termed *sequens sonus*; but by that is to be understood the final or closing sound of a syllable. Any other nasal may be used as the initial letter of a syllable; but the nasal Anuswâra is exclusively an "after" sound, or final. It is not even capable of blending, as it were, with a following vowel, like a final *n* or *m*, as in *tân-* or *tâmabravît*. It is the legitimate representative of either of the other nasals when those are absolutely terminal,

[G. Ed. p. 11.] That the Indian Grammarians, however, consider the *m* and not the *ṅ* as the original but mutable letter in grammatical terminations, like अम् *am*, भ्याम् *bhyâm*, &c., appears from the fact that they always write these terminations, where they give them separate, with the labial nasal, and not with Anuswâra. If it be objected that this is of no importance, as dependent on the caprice of the editor or copyist, we can adduce as a decisive proof of the just views of the Indian Grammarians in this respect, that when they range the declensions of words in the order of their terminating letters, the Pronouns इदम् *idam*, and किम् *kim*, in which they consider the *m* as primitive, are treated when the turn comes of the labial nasal *m*, and together with प्रशाम् *praśâm*, "quiet," from the root शम् *śam*. (Laghu-Kaumudî, p. 46.)

10. The deadened nasal, which is expressed in the Lithuanian by particular signs over the vowel which it follows, appears to be identical with the Sanskṛit Anuswâra; and we write it in the same manner with *ṅ*. At the end of words it stands for the remainder of an ancient *m*, in the accusative singular for example; and the deadening of *n* before *s* into *ṅ* presents

---

terminal, and in pronunciation retains their respective sounds, according to the initial consonant of the following word. Again, with regard to its relation to the semi-vowels and sibilants, it may be regarded as appropriate to them merely in as far as neither of the other nasals is so considered. In this sense Anuswâra may be termed a subsidiary or supplemental sound, being prefixed with most propriety to those letters which, not being classed under either of the five series of sounds, have no rightful claim to the nasals severally comprehended within each respective series.—*Editor.*

a remarkable accordance with the Sanskṛit rule of euphony before mentioned. From *laupsin-u*, "I praise," therefore comes *laupsiṅsu*, "I shall praise;" as in Sanskṛit हंस्यामि *haṅsyâmi*, "I shall kill," from the root हन् *han*. In the Prâkṛit, not only the म् *m*, but the न् *n*, at the end of words, has always fallen into Anuswâra, without regard to the following letters. Thus we read in Chezy's edition of the Śakuntalâ, p. 70, भअवं, which is certainly to be pronounced, not *bhaavam*, but *bhaavaṅ*, for भगवन् *bhagavan;* [G. Ed. p. 12.] कुधं *kudhaṅ*, for कुथम *kutham.*[*]

11. The second of the signs before mentioned is named Visarga, which signifies abandonment. It expresses a breathing, which is never primitive, but only appears at the end of words in the character of an euphonic alteration of स् *s* and र् *r*. These two letters (*s*, *r*) are very mutable at the end of words, and are changed into Visarga before a pause or the deadened letters of the guttural and labial classes (§. 12.). We write this sign *ḣ* to distinguish it from the true ह् *h*.

12. The proper consonants are classed in the Sanskṛit alphabet according to the organs used in their pronunciation; and form, in this division, five classes. A sixth is formed by the semi-vowels, and a seventh by the sibilants and the ह् *h*. In the first five ranks of these consonants the single letters are so arranged, that the first are the surd or hard consonants, the thin (*tenues*), and their aspirates; next, the sonant or soft, the medials, and their aspirates, each class being completed by its nasal. The nasals belong, like the vowels and semi-vowels, to the sonants; the sibilants to the surd or hard. Every thin and every medial letter has its corresponding aspirate. The aspirates are pronounced, like their

---

[*] No native scholar would read these as *bhaavaṅ* or *kudhaṅ*, as the text affirms, but *bha-avam*, *kudham*, agreeably to the final म represented by Anuswâra.—*Editor*.

respective non-aspirates, with a clearly audible *h*; thus, for example, थ् *t̓h*, not like the English *th*; फ् *ṗh*, not *f* or *φ*; and ख् *kh*, not like the Greek χ.* In an etymological point of view it is important to observe that the aspirates of different organs are easily exchanged with each other; thus, भर् *bhar*, धर् *dhar*, (भृ *bhṛi*, धृ *dhṛi*, §. 1.) "to bear," "to hold," are perhaps originally identical. धूमस् *dhûma-s*, [G. Ed. p. 13.] "smoke," is, in Latin, *fumu-s*. In Greek, *θάνω*, as well as *φένω*, is related to हन् *han*, from धन् *dhan*, "to kill." The Gothic *thliuhan* is the German *fliehen*, Old High German *vliuhan*.

13. The first class is that of the gutturals, and includes the letters क् *k*, ख् *kh*, ग् *g*, घ् *gh*, ङ् *n*. The nasal of this class is pronounced like the German *n* before gutturals, as in the words *sinken*, *enge*, so as to prepare for the following guttural. In the middle of words it is only found before gutturals; and, at the end, supplies the place of म् *m* when the following word begins with a guttural.† We write it without the distinctive sign, as its guttural nature is easily recognised by the following consonant. The aspirates of this class are not of frequent use, either at the beginning or end of words. In some Greek words we find χ in the place of ख् *kh*: compare *ὄνυξ*, *ὄνυχ-ος*, with *nakha*, "a nail;" *κόνχη*, *κόνχος*, with *śankha*, "shell;" *χαίνω*, *χανῶ*, with *khan*, "to

---

* The original here adds—"We designate the aspirate by a comma, as *t*‘, *d*‘, *b*‘." The use of such a mark is, however, unsightly, and appears likely to cause occasional perplexity and doubt. It seems therefore preferable to adhere to the usual mode of expressing the aspirated letters, as *dh*, *bh*, and the like. It is only necessary to remember that *th* and *ph* are the letters *t* and *p* with an aspiration, and not the *th* and *f* of the English alphabet—*Editor*.

† A careful examination will perhaps shew that the several nasals of the Sanskṛit alphabet are mere modifications of one sound, according to the manner in which that is affected by a succeeding letter; and that the modifications prevail equally in most languages, although it has not been thought necessary to provide them with distinct symbols.—*Editor*.

dig." As regards the sonant aspirates, the घ *gh* of *gharma*, "heat" (in Greek *θέρμη*), has passed into the aspiration of another organ; लघु *laghu*, "light," has laid aside the guttural in the Latin *levis*, and, in virtue of the *i*, changed the *u* into *v*. The guttural has kept its place in the German *leicht*, the English *light*, and the Old High German *lihti*.

14. The second class is that of the palatals; and includes the sounds *ch* and *j*, with their aspirates and nasal. We write च् *ch*, छ् *chh*, ज् *j*,* झ् *jh*,* ञ *n*. This class is an offshoot from the preceding, and to be considered as a softening of it. It is only found before vowels and weak consonants (semi-vowels and nasals); and before strong consonants, and at the end of a word, generally retires into the class from which it springs. Thus, for example, the base [G. Ed. p. 14.] वाच *vâch*, "speech," "voice" (cf. *vox*), makes, in the uninflected nominative, वाक् *vâk;* in the instrumental and locative plurals, वाग्भिस् *vâg-bhis*, वाक्षु *vâkṣhu*. In the cognate languages we have to look for, in the place of the letters of this class, first, gutturals; next labials, on account of their mutual affinity; thirdly, the sounds of *t*, as, according to pronunciation, the first element of the palatals is a *t* or *d;* fourthly, sibilants, as being the last element in the letters of this class. Compare पचामि *pachâmi*, "I cook" (inf. *paktum*, part. pass. *pakta*), with *coquo*, *πέπω* (*πέπτω*, *πέττω*, *πέσσω*); चतुर् *chatur*, "four," nom. चत्वारस् *chatwâras*, with *quatuor*, *τέτταρες*, *τέσσαρες*, Gothic *fidvôr*, Lithuanian *ketturi;* पञ्चन् *panchan*, "five" (nom. accus. *pancha*), with *quinque*, *πέντε*, *πέμπε*, Gothic *fimf*, Lithuanian *penki;* राजन् *râjan*, "king," with *rex*, *regis;* राजत *râjata*, nom. *râjatam*, "silver" (from *râj*, "to shine"), with *argentum*, *ἄργυρος*; जानु *jânu*, "knee," with *genu*, *γόνυ*. With regard to the aspirates of this class, the *chh*, as an initial letter in some words, answers to *sc*, *σκ*; छिन्दस *chhind-*

---

* The original has *ǵ* and *g̋;* but the appropriate symbols in English are *j* and its aspirate.

mas, "we cleave," छिनद्मि *chhinadmi,* " "I cleave," answers to the Latin *scindo;* छाया *chhâyâ,* "shadow," to the Greek *σκιά.* As the terminating letter of a root *chh* answers, in प्रछ् *prachh,* "to ask," to the Gothic *h* in *frah,* "I or he asked," and to the German and Latin *g* in *frage, rogo,* in case that the latter, as I suspect, is a modification of *progo.* The nasal of this class, for which we require no distinctive sign, as it only precedes palatals, deviates but slightly from the sound of the guttural *n,* and is pronounced nearly like *nj.*

15. The third class is called that of the linguals or cerebrals, and embraces a peculiar kind of sounds of *t,* together with its [G. Ed. p. 15.] nasal; a kind not original, but which has developed itself from the ordinary class of *t* sounds. We distinguish them by a point under the letter, thus, ट् *ṭ,* ठ् *ṭh,* ड् *ḍ,* ढ् *ḍh,* ण् *ṇ.* In the Prâkṛit this class has obtained great supremacy, and has frequently supplanted the ordinary *t.* We there find, for example, भोडु *bhôḍu,* for भवतु *bhavatu,* "let it be;" and पढम *paḍhama,* for प्रथम *prathama,* "the first." With regard to the nasal, the substitution of ण् for न् is nearly universal. The Indian Grammarians approach the Prâkṛit nearer than the Sanskṛit, when at the beginning of roots they use the same substitution. The practice, also, which we have condemned (§. 9.), of using Anuswâra for म् *m,* at the end of words, is more Prâkṛit than Sanskṛit. At the beginning of words these letters are seldom found in Sanskṛit, but they are found as terminations to a certain number of roots; for example, अट् *aṭ,* "to go." They are pronounced by bending back the tongue against the roof of the mouth, by which a hollow sound is expressed, as if from the head.* The nasal of this class has sometimes overstepped the limits of its usual laws: it is found before vowels, which

---

* Here, also, it may be doubted if similar modifications of the dental sounds are not discoverable in languages which do not express them by separate symbols. The *t* of the Italian *tutto* is the Sanskṛit ट.—*Editor.*

is not the case with the nasals of the preceding classes; yet never at the beginning of words.

16. The fourth class embraces the dentals, or the sounds which properly answer to the common *d* and *t*, together with the common *n*, which belongs to them, त् *t*, थ् *th*, द् *d*, ध् *dh*, न् *n*. Of the aspirates of this organ, we have to remark, that थ् *th*, in an etymological respect, never—at least in no instance of which we are aware—is represented in Greek by *θ*, but always like the natural *t*, by *τ*. On the other hand, ध् *dh* does correspond to *θ*, which also sometimes represents द् *d*. Thus the imperative ending धि *dhi*, in Greek becomes *θι*; मधु *madhu*, "honey," "wine," is *μέθυ*; दधामि *dadhâmi*, "I place," *τίθημι*; दुहितर् *duhitar* [G. Ed. p. 16.] (दुहितृ *duhitṛi*, §. 1.), "daughter," *θυγάτηρ*; द्वार् *dwâr*, f. and *dwâra*, neut. (nom. *dwâram*), "door," *θύρα*; देव *dêva*, Lithuan. *diewas*, "God," Θεός. With regard to the hard aspirate, compare the terminations *τε* and *τον* with थ *tha* and थस् *thas*, the former in the plural, the second in the dual of the present and future; *στήσω* with स्थास्यामि *sthâsyâmi*, "I shall stand"; *ὀστέον* with अस्थि *asthi*, "bone"; in the Latin, *rota* with रथ *ratha*, "carriage"; and in the Gothic, the ending *t*, in the second person singular of the preterite, with *tha*; for example, *vais-t*, "thou knewest," with वेत्थ *vêt-tha*. From the beginning of words in the Sanskṛit this aspirate is nearly excluded.

17. The interchange of *d* and *l* is well known. Upon it, among other instances, is founded the relation of *lacryma* to *δάκρυ*, *δάκρυμα*. In Sanskṛit, also, an apparently original द् *d* often corresponds to the *l* of cognate European languages; for example, दीप् *dîp*, "to light," दीप *dîpa*, "lamp," becomes *λάμπω*, *λαμπάς*; देह *dêha*, "body," Gothic *leik*. On this relation also rests, as I have shewn elsewhere, the relation of our *lf*, Gothic *lif*, in *elf*, *zwölf*, Gothic *tvalif*, to दशन् *daśan*, *δέκα*. As also the second consonant has undergone alteration, and has migrated from the gutturals into the

labials; and as, moreover, the number "ten," taken alone, is, in Gothic, *taihun*, in German *zehn*, its origin from *lif* was deeply concealed; and even the Lithuanian *lika*, which accompanies the simple numbers in their compounded forms from eleven to twenty, remained long under my notice without result. The fact, however, that one and the same word may, in the course of time, assume various forms for various objects, proved, as it is, by numberless examples, requires no further [G. Ed. p. 17.] support. With respect to the affinity of λίκος in ἡλίκος, &c., and of the Gothic *leiks* in *hvêleiks*, "like to whom?" to दृश *dṛiśa*, Prâkṛit दिस *disa*, "like," I refer the reader to my Treatise on the Pronoun and its influence (Berlin, published by Dümmler); and only remark, in addition, that by this analogy of λίκος, *leiks*, I was first led to that of *lif* to δέκα; while the Lithuanian *lika* had not yet attracted my observation.

18. The labial class comes next, namely, प् *p*, फ् *ph*, ब् *b*, भ् *bh*, म् *m*. The hard aspirate *ph* is among the rarer letters; the most usual words in which it occurs are, फल *phala*, "fruit," फेन *phêna*, "foam," and the forms which come from the root फुल्ल् *phull*, "to burst, blow, bloom." The sonant aspirate भ् *bh* belongs, together with ध् *dh*, to the most frequent of the aspirates. In the Greek and Latin, φ and *f* are the letters which most frequently correspond to this भ् *bh*, especially at the beginning of words; for example, भृ *bhṛi*, "to bear," *fero*, φέρω; भू *bhû*, "to be," *fu-i*, φύ-ω. भ् *bh* is also often represented by *b* in Latin, especially in the middle of words. The *f* of *fero* becomes *b* in certain compounds which rank as simple words with a derivable suffix, as *ber*, *brum*, *brium*, in words like *saluber*, *candelabrum*, *manubrium*. Thus the *f* of *fu* appears as *b* in the forms *amabam*, *amabo*, which I have recognised as compounds, and which will be hereafter explained. The dative and ablative termination plural भ्यस् *bhyas*, becomes *bus* in Latin. The nasal of this class, म् *m*, is subject, at the end of a word, to several alterations, and only remains fast before a pause, a

vowel, or letters of its own class: it otherwise governs itself according to the nature of the following letters, and may pass, in this manner, into any of the four preceding nasals, and weakens itself into the softened nasal sound [G. Ed. p. 18.] of the proper Anuswâra, if followed by a semi-vowel, a sibilant, or ह् *h*. *M* has also a full right to the name of a mutable nasal. It is, however, not beseeming, when, in editions of a text otherwise conspicuous for accuracy, we find म्, though protected in its original condition by a pause, or by the following letters, written as Anuswâra.

19. The semi-vowels follow next: य् *y*, र् *r*, ऌ् *l*, व् *v*. We distinguish *y* by the sound of our German *j*, or the English *y* in the word *year*. As the Latin *j* in English has the sound of a softened *g*, so in Prâkṛit य् *y* often passes into ज् *j*; and in Greek, upon this exchange of sound rests the relation of *ζεύγνυμι*, *ζυγός*, &c. to the root युज् *yuj*, "to bind," and that of the verbs in *άζω* to the Indian verbs in अयामि *ayâmi*; for *ζ* is *ds*, but the sound *dsch* is not to be looked for in the Greek. The relation of the Persian جوان *javân*, "young," to the Sanskṛit Theme युवन् *yuvan*, Lat. *juvenis*, belongs to this place. By *v* we here designate the sound of the German *w* and English *v*. After consonants, as त्वाम् *twâm*, "thee," this letter takes the pronunciation of the English *w*. The occasional hardening of the *v* into a guttural deserves mention here; thus, in Latin, *vic-si* (*vixi*), *victum*, spring from *viv*; and in *facio* I recognise the Sanskṛit causal भावयामि *bhâv-ayâ-mi*, "I make to be," from the root भू *bhû*. The connection between *fac-tus* and *fio* is practically demonstrated. Refer back, in the Old and Modern Greek, to the occasional hardening of the Digamma into γ (cf. C. G. Schmidt in the Berlin Jahrbuch, 1831, p. 613.). The voice cannot dwell on व् *v* or य् *y*; and these two letters are therefore, as in the Semitic languages, excluded from the end of words: [G. Ed. p. 19.] therefore the word दिव् *div*, "Heaven," forms its nominative, which ought to be *div* (*divs* being forbidden, see §. 94.),

from द्यो *dyô*. Nominal bases in *y* do not exist. र् *r* at the end of a word is subject to many alterations, and is interchangeable with स् *s*. In places where the concluding *s*, by favour of the following letter, is retained, र् *r* becomes स् *s*; and, on the other hand, remains unaltered in places where स् *s* becomes र् *r*, namely, before vowels and sonant consonants.

20. The semi-vowels, by reason of their tractable and fluent nature, are easily interchanged. For instance, in the more recent Sanskṛit works ल् *l* often stands for र् *r*.* We often, also, find in the cognate European languages *l* for व् *v*. On this interchange is founded the relation of the Latin suffix *lent* (*e.g. opulens*), and of the Gothic *laud*(*a*)-*s*† (see §. 116.), in *hvêlauds*, "quantus," *svalauds*, "tantus," *samalauds*, "just so much," to the Sanskṛit वन्त् *vant* (in the strong case, §. 119.), in words like धनवन्त् *dhanavant*, "endowed with wealth," तावन्त् *tâvant*, "so much," यावन्त् *yâvant*, "how much." On the change between *v* and *r* is founded, as I believe, the relation of the Old High German *pir-u-mês*, "we are" (sing. *pim*, भवामि *bhav-â-mi*), to भवामस् *bhav-â-mas*; as also that of *scrir-u-mês*, "we shriek," to श्रावयामस् *śrâv-ayâ-mas*, "we make to hear" (§. 109.); as also that of *triusu*, "I fall," from the [G. Ed. p. 20.] root *trus*, to the Sanskṛit ध्वंस् *dhwaṅs*, "to fall;"‡ and of the Cretan *τρέ* "thee" from *τϝέ*, to the Sanskṛit *twâ*. The semi-vowel *l* is also exchanged with the nasals; thus, अन्यस् *anya-s*, "the other," becomes *alius* in Latin, and

---

* It is scarcely correct to say "often," as the instances are rare: nor are they restricted to recent works. Menu has *aślîka* for *aśrîka*.—*Ed.*

† Grimm (iii. p. 46) assumes an adjective *lauds*, "great;" which, as far as the Gothic at least is concerned, might be dispensed with, as it is of the greatest antiquity as a suffix, and does not appear alone as an adjective, even in the oldest periods.

‡ *Dh*, according to §. 16., = the Greek *ϑ*; and to the *ϑ*, according to §. 87., corresponds the old High German *t*. The *u* of *trus*, from the old *a*, may be produced by the influence of the *r*, or of the dropped nasal.

अन्तरस् *antara-s*, "the other," *alter;* वद् *vad,* "to speak," answers to the Gothic *lath-ôn*, "called," "invited," *ga-lathôn*, "called together": ध्मा *dhma,* "to blow," answers to *flare.* (§. 109.) Compare, also, *balbus* with *βαμβαίνω*.

21. The last class embraces the sibilants and *h*: श् *ś*, ष् *sh*, स *s*, and ह् *h*. The first sibilant is spoken with a slight aspiration, and usually written by the English *sh*.* It belongs to the palatal class, and thence supplies the place of the third or proper स *s* when a hard palatal च् *ch* or छ् *chh* follows; for instance, रामश् चरति *râmaś charati,* instead of रामस् चरति *râmas charati,* "Râmas goes." In its origin, श् *ś* appears to have sprung from *k*; and in Greek and Latin we find *κ* and *c* regularly corresponding to the Sanskrit श् *ś*. The Gothic substitutes *h* in pursuance of the law of change of sound; but the Lithuanian stands the nearest to the Sanskrit with reference to this letter, and has in its stead a sibilant compound *sz*, pronounced like *sh*. Compare *decem*, *δέκα*, Gothic *taihun*, Lithuan. *dészimtis*, with दशन् *daśan* (nom. दश *daśa*); *canis*, *κύων*, Gothic *hunds,* Lithuan. *szuo* (gen. *szuns*), with श्वन् *śwan* (nom. श्वा *śwâ*, gen. शुनस् *śunas*, *κυνός*), "dog;" *δάκρυ*, *lacrima*, *aszara*, f. with अश्रु *aśru* n. "tear;" *equus* (= *ecvus*), Lith. *aszwa* f. "mare," with अश्व *aśwa* (nom. अश्वस् *aśwas*), "horse;" *szaka* f. with शाखा *śâkhâ* "bough." The Lith. *szwenta-s*, "holy," answers to the Zend 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬀 *ṡpĕnta* (§. 50.). At the end of a word, and in the middle before strong consonants, श् *ś* is not allowed, although admitted as an euphonic substitute for a concluding स् *s* before an initial hard palatal. Otherwise श् *ś* usually falls back into the sound from which [G. Ed. p. 21.] it appears to have originated, namely, *k*. In some roots, however, श् *ś* passes into ट् *ṭ*; for instance, दृश् *driś*, "seeing," and विश् *viś*, "a man of the third caste," form, in the uninflected nominative, दृक् *drik*, विट् *viṭ*. The second sibilant, ष् *sh*, is pronounced like our *sch*, or *sh* in English, and

---

* More usually *ś*; the *sh* is reserved for the cerebral sibilant.—*Editor.*

belongs to the lingual class. It often steps, according to certain rules into the place of स् *s;* thus, for instance, after क् *k*, स् *s* never follows, but only ष *ṣh*; and the ξ, *x*, in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by क्ष *kṣh*. Compare दक्षिण *dakṣhiṇa*, with *dex-ter*, δεξιός, Lithuanian *dészinė*, "the right hand." Of the vowels, *i*, *u*, and *ṛi*, short or long, are averse from स् *s*, to which *a* and *â* alone are inclined. After the first-named vowels, स् *s* passes into ष् *ṣh*; for instance, तनोषि *tanôṣhi*, instead of तनोसि *tanôsi* (*extendis*). As an initial, ष् *ṣh* is extremely rare: the Indian grammarians, however, write the roots which, under certain circumstances, change स् *s* into ष् *ṣh*, from the first with a ष् *ṣh*. A word which really begins with ष् *ṣh* is षष् *ṣhaṣh*, "six;" to which the Lith. *szeszi*, a plural nominative, answers most nearly, while other cognate languages indicate an original ordinary *s*. At the end of a word, and in the middle before other strong consonants, such as ट् *ṭ*, ठ् *ṭh*, ष् *ṣh* is not permitted, but in most roots passes into क् *k*, but with some into ट् *ṭ*: the number six, mentioned above, becomes, in the uninflected nominative, षट् *shaṭ*.

22. The third sibilant is the ordinary *s* of all languages, but which, at the end of Sanskṛit words, holds a very insecure position, and by certain rules is subjected to transmutation into श् *ś*, ष् *ṣh*, र् *r*, : *ah* or *ḣ* Visarga (§. 11.), and *u*; and only remains unaltered before *t* and *th*. We write, for example, सूनुस् तरति *sûnus tarati*, "the son passes over," but तरति सूनुः *tarati*
[G. Ed. p. 22.] *sûnuḣ*, सूनुश् चरति *sûnuś charati* (*it*), सूनुर् भवति *sûnur bhavati* (*est*). This sensitiveness against a concluding स *s* can only have arisen in the later period of the language, after its division; as in the cognate languages the concluding *s* remains unaltered, or where it has been changed for *r* does not return into its original form. Thus, in the decree against Timotheus (Maittaire, §. 383-4.) ρ everywhere stands for ς: Τιμόσεορ ὁ Μιλήσιορ—παραγινόμενορ—λυμαίνεται τὰρ ἀκοὰρ τῶν νέων, &c.* The Sanskṛit could not endure

---

* Cf. Hartung, p. 106.

r before *t*. The Latin protects the *s* usually at the end of words; but in the classical period generally sacrifices it, when between two vowels, to the *r*; for instance, *genus, generis*, for *genesis;* a contrast to forms found in Varro and Festus, such as *plusima, fœdesum, meliosem, majosibus*, in which the *s* evinces its original existence in the history of the language (see §. 127.). The accusative form *arbosem*, recorded by Festus, is more startling, for here *r* is the original form, if, as I can hardly doubt, *arbor, arbos*, is related to the word of such frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, 𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬀 *urvara*, "tree." This expression is not wanting in the Sanskṛit, (उर्वरा *urvarâ*;) but it signifies, according to Wilson, "fruitful land," and "land" in general.

23. ह् *h* belongs to the letters which, in Sanskṛit, are never admitted at the end of words, nor in the middle before strong consonants. In these places it passes, by certain rules, into ट् *ṭ*, ड् *ḍ*, क् *k*, or ग् *g*. In Greek we often find χ in the place of the Sanskṛit ह् *h:* compare *χειμών, hiems*, with हिम *hima*, "snow," "rime;" *χαίρω* with हृष्यामि *hṛiṣhyâmi*, [G. Ed. p. 23.] *gaudeo; χήν* with हंस *haṅsa*, "goose;" *χθές, heri*, with ह्यस् *hyas*, "yesterday;" *ὄχος* with वह् *vah*, "to transport." We also find *κ, c*, for *h:* compare *καρδία, cor*, Gothic *hairtô*, with हृद् *hṛid* (n. हृदय *hṛidaya*), "heart." We sometimes, but rarely, find the spiritus asper substituted for *h*; for instance, *αἱρέω*, हरामि *harâmi*, "I take away." The Lithuanian exhibits sometimes *sz* for *h;* for instance, *asz*, "I," for अहम् *aham, szirdis* f. "heart," for हृद् *hṛid*. This letter stands sometimes in Sanskṛit for a mutilation of other aspirated consonants, of which the aspiration alone has been suppressed; thus, instead of the imperative ending धि *dhi*, we generally find *hi*; on which account the grammarians accept हि *hi*, and not धि *dhi*, as the original ending, and assume that *hi* passes into *dhi*, for euphonic reasons, after consonants. The root ग्रह् *grah*, "to take," is written in the Vedas ग्रभ् *grabh*, and answers thus more nearly to the German *greifen*, and the Persian *giriftan*.

We give here a general view of the Sanscrit characters, with their respective values.

VOWELS.

अ *a*, आ *â*, इ *i*, ई *î*, उ *u*, ऊ *û*, ऋ *ṛi*, ॠ *ṛī*.

ANUSWÂRA AND VISARGA.

ं *ṅ*, ः *aḣ*.

CONSONANTS.

Gutturals	क *k*,	ख *kh*,	ग *g*,	घ *gh*,	ङ *n*.
Palatals	च *ch*,	छ *chh*,	ज *j*,	झ *jh*,	ञ *n*.
Linguals	ट *ṭ*,	ठ *ṭh*,	ड *ḍ*,	ढ *ḍh*,	ण *ṇ*.
Dentals	त *t*,	थ *th*,	द *d*,	ध *dh*,	न *n*.
Labials	प *p*,	फ *ph*,	ब *b*,	भ *bh*,	म *m*.
Semi-Vowels	य *y*,	र *r*,	ल *l*,	व *v*.	
Sibilants and Aspirates,	श *ś*,	ष *ṣh*,	स *s*,	ह *h*.	

[G. Ed. p. 24.] The vowel characters given above are found only at the beginning of words; and in the middle or end of a word are supplied in the following manner: अ *a* is left unexpressed, but is contained in every consonant which is not distinguished by a sign of rest (्) or connected with another vowel. क *k* is thus read *ka;* and *k* by itself, or the absence of the *a*, is expressed by क्. इ *i*, ई *î*, are expressed by ि, ी, and the first of these two is placed before, the second after, the consonant to which it relates; for instance, कि *ki*, की *kî*. For उ *u*, ऊ *û*, ऋ *ṛi*, ॠ *ṛī*, the signs ु, ू, ृ, ॄ, are placed under their consonants; as, कु *ku*, कू *kû*, कृ *kṛi*, कॄ *kṛī*. For ए *ê* and ऐ *âi*, े and ै are placed over their consonants; as, के *kê*, कै *kâi*: ओ *ô* and औ *âu* are written by omission of the अ, which is here only a fulcrum; as, को *kô*, कौ *kâu*. The consonants without vowels, instead of appearing in their entire shapes, and with the sign of rest, are usually written so that their distinctive sign is connected with the following consonant; for instance, for त्, स्, य्, we have त्‍, स्‍, य्‍; and thus *matsya* is written मत्स्य, not मत्‌स्‌य; for ज् + ञ् we have ज्ञ्; and for क् + ष् we have क्ष्.

25. The Sanskṛit letters are divided into hard or surd, and soft or sonant. Surd are, all the tenues, with their corresponding aspirates; and in fact, according to the order given above, the first two letters in each of the first five rows, also the three sibilants. Soft are, the medials, with their aspirates, the ह्, the nasals, semi-vowels, and all vowels. Another division also appears to us convenient—that of the consonants into strong and weak; in which the nasals and semi-vowels come under the denomination of weak; the remaining consonants under that of the strong. The weak consonants and vowels exercise no influence, as initial letters of inflections and suffixes, in the formation of words, on the terminating [G. Ed. p. 25.] letters of a root; while they themselves are compelled to accommodate themselves to a following strong consonant.

26. With regard to the vowels, it is of consequence to direct the observation to two affections of them, of frequent occurrence in the development of forms of Sanskṛit; of which the one is called Guna, or virtue; the other Vṛiddhi, increase or augmentation. My predecessors in grammatical inquiry have given no information as to the essence, but have only expounded the effects of these vowel alterations; and it was only in my critical labours upon Grimm's German Grammar* that I came upon the trace of the true nature and distinctive qualities of these affections, as also of the law by which Guna is usually produced and governed, and at the same time of its hitherto undetected existence in the Greek and Germanic, and, most conspicuously, in the Gothic. My views in this particular have since derived remarkable confirmation from the Zend, with relation to which I refer to §. 2., in which, as I flatter myself, I have dealt successfully with an apparent contradiction to my explanation. Guna consists in prefixing short *a*, and Vṛiddhi in prefixing a long one: in both, however, the *a* melts into a diphthong with the primitive vowel,

---

* Berlin Journal, Feb. 1827, p. 254.

according to certain euphonic laws. इ *i*, namely, and ई, melt with the अ *a* of Guna into ए *ê*; उ *u*, ऊ *û*, into ओ *ô*. These diphthongs, however, dissolve again before vowels into अय् *ay* and अव् *av*; ऋ *ṛi* and ॠ *ṛī* become, in virtue of the action of Guna, अर् *ar*; by that of Vṛiddhi, आर् *âr*. As in Greek the [G. Ed. p. 26.] short Sanskṛit *a* is frequently replaced by ε; so we find the Guna here, when a radical ι or υ is prolonged by prefixing an ε. As in the Sanskṛit the root इ *i*, "to go," forms, by the Guna modification, एमि *êmi* (from *a-imi*), "I go," in contrast to *imas*, "we go;" thus in Greek also we have εἶμι in contrast to ιμεν. As the root बुध् *budh*, in several tenses in the three numbers, rises, in virtue of Guna, into बोध *bôdh* (from *baudh*), for instance, बोधामि *bôdhâmi*, "I know;" so in the Greek* the root φυγ (ἔφυγον), in the present becomes φεύγω. In the Gothic, in the strong form of Grimm's 8th and 9th conjugations, the radical vowel, strengthened by *a* in the singular of the preterite, stands in the same contrast to the *i* and *u* of the plural, as is the case in the corresponding tense of the Sanskṛit. Compare *baug*, "I bent," in contrast to *bugum*, "we bent," with the Sanskṛit form of the same signification, singular बुभोज *bubhôja*, plural बुभुजिम *bubhujima*, of the root भुज् *bhuj*; compare *vait*, "I know," in contrast with *vitum*, "we know," with the Sanskṛit forms of the same signification, वेद *vêda* (from *vaïda*), विदिम *vidima*, from the root विद् *vid*, "know," which, like the corresponding Gothic and Greek root, employs the terminations of the preterite with a present signification.

27. We have, however, the Sanskṛit Guna in yet another form in the Gothic—a form which I have but lately discovered, but of which the historical connection with the Sanskṛit modification appears to me not the less certain. I once thought that I had accounted in a different manner for the relation existing between *biuga*, "I bend," and its root

---

* Regarding Greek οι as Guna of ι, see §. 491.; and as to Guna in Old Sclavonic and Lithuanian, see §§. 255.b) f), 741., 746.

bug, and I conceived myself bound to ascribe generally, in the present tense, to the prevalent *i* of terminations a retro-active influence. It now, however, seems to me indisputable that Grimm's 8th and 9th conjugations of the [G. Ed. p. 27.] first class correspond to my first Sanskṛit conjugation (r. 326.); so that the Guna *a* of the special tenses has been weakened to *i*, while the monosyllabic preterite maintains the Guna vowel in the more important shape of *a*; just as in the 10th, 11th, and 12th conjugations, according to Grimm's division, the radical *a*, which has remained in the preterite singular, is, in the present and other tenses, weakened to *i*; so that, for instance, *at*, "I" and "he eat," corresponds to the root अद् *ad*, "to eat;" but in the present, *ita* stands in place of the form अद्मि *admi*, "I eat."*

28. The Zend possesses, besides the Sanskṛit Guna, which has remained everywhere where it stands in Sanskṛit, a vowel application peculiar to itself, which likewise consists in 𐬀 *a*, and which was first observed by M. E. Burnouf.† The vowels which admit this addition in the interior, but not at the end of words, are, first, the short 𐬌 *i*, 𐬎 *u*, 𐬊 *o*; 2dly, the Guna diphthongs 𐬉 *ê* and 𐬋 *ô*. The two latter are the most usually befriended by this addition, and 𐬉 *ê* takes it in all cases where the opportunity occurs, both as an initial letter, and even at the end of words wherever the dependent particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, "and," is appended to it; hence, for example, 𐬥𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬉 *nairê*, "*homini*," 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬉 *âthre*, "*igni*"; but 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬉𐬗𐬀 *naraêcha*, "*hominique*," 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬉𐬗𐬀 *âthraêcha*, "*ignique*." Also where an *ê* stands in two consecutive syllables, an *a* is placed before each. Hence, for instance, 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀𐬉𐬌𐬠𐬫𐬋 *aêtaêibyô*, from एतेभ्यस् *êtêbhyas*. The only case in which, ex-

---

* It would be difficult to adduce a better instance of the phonetic deficiencies of our English alphabet than this sentence, in which I am forced to translate the present and past tenses of *essen* by the same characters. What foreign student could guess or remember that the one is pronounced *eet*, the other *ett*? The preterite "ate" is obsolete.—*Translator*.

† N. Journ. Asiat., T. III. p. 327.

cepting at the actual end of the word, 𐬉 *ê* remains without the preceding 𐬀 *a*, is when it is produced by the influence of a 𐬫 *y*, out of 𐬀 *a* or 𐬁 *â*. We say, indeed, 𐬫𐬀𐬉𐬌𐬠𐬫𐬋 [G. Ed. p. 28.] *yaêibyô*, "*quibus*," from येभ्यस् *yêbhyas;* but not 𐬁𐬫𐬀𐬉𐬯𐬉 *âyaêsê*, but 𐬁𐬫𐬉𐬯𐬉 *âyêsê*, "I glorify," from the Sanskṛit root, which has been lost, for the verb यश् *yaś*, from which comes यशस् *yaśas*, "glory." Yet we find, for 𐬫𐬉𐬰𐬌 *yêzi*, "if" (cf. यदि *yadi*), sometimes, though perhaps erroneously, also 𐬫𐬀𐬉𐬰𐬌 *yaêzi*. The addition of the 𐬀 *a* before 𐬋 *ô* is just as unlimited, but the occasion is far less frequent. Examples of it are, 𐬀𐬋𐬰𐬋 *aôzô*, "strength," from ओजस् *ôjas;* 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬀𐬋𐬙 *kĕrĕnaôt*, "he made," from कृ *kṛi*, according to the fifth class, for अकृणोत् *akṛiṇôt;* 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬋𐬙 *mraôt*, "he spoke," from अब्रोत् *abrôt*, which would be the regular form, instead of अब्रवीत् *abravît* (Gramm. Crit. r. 352.). We also find 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬋𐬨 *mraôm*, "I spoke," for अब्रोम् *abrôm*, which would be the form used were, in the Sanskṛit adjunct tenses, as in the Greek, a mere nasal, and not अम् *am*, the suffix of the first person. The vowels 𐬌 *i* and 𐬎 *u* are much more sparing in their attraction of the 𐬀 *a* now in question: they refuse it always at the beginning of words, and in the middle before two consonants; and if transferred from the end of a word to its middle, by an adventitious termination or word, they do not acquire the capacity of being wedded to an 𐬀 *a*. We say, for example, 𐬌𐬨𐬆𐬨 *imĕm*, "this" (accus.), not 𐬀𐬌𐬨𐬆𐬨 *aimĕm;* 𐬨𐬌𐬚𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬀 *mithwana*, "a pair," not 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬚𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬀 *maithwana;* 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬠𐬫𐬋 *gairibyô*, "*montibus*," not 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬀𐬌𐬠𐬫𐬋 *gairaibyô*. The 𐬎 *u* also, according to set rules, very frequently abstains from the 𐬀 *a;* for instance, 𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬋 *urunô*, (*animæ*,) not 𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬥𐬋 *uraunô*, from 𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬥 *urvan;* on the contrary, 𐬙𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬀 *tauruna*, "young," from तरुण *taruṇa*. Where, however, the Sanskṛit उ *u* is replaced by 𐬋 *o* (§. 32.), an 𐬀 *a* is placed before it, as well at the beginning as before two consonants; and in this case 𐬊 *o* stands in this respect in the same category as 𐬉 *ê* and [G. Ed. p. 29.] 𐬋 *ô*. Compare 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗 *raoch*, "light," with

रुच् *ruch;* 𐬯𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬀𐬢𐬨 *śaochantaṅm* (*lucentium*) with शुच्यताम् *śuchyatâm;* 𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬙𐬀 *aocta,* "he spoke," with उक्त *ukta,* which I form, by theory, after the analogy of अक्षिप्त *akshipta* (Gram. Crit. r. 389.), leaving out the augment.

29. In the Vṛiddhi modification, the vowels इ *i,* ई *î,* melt with the preceding आ *â* into ऐ *âi;* उ *u,* ऊ *û,* into औ *âu;* ऋ *ṛi,* ॠ *ṛî,* into आर् *âr.* The simple vowel अ *a,* as also the diphthongs ए *e* and ओ *o,* which would produce the same effect by Guna as by Vṛiddhi—for *a+a,* like *â+a.* makes *â;* *a+ê,* like *â+ê,* makes *âi;* *a+ô,* like *â+ô,* makes *âu*—are capable of only one higher modification, and reserve this one for cases where grammatical laws demand the highest step, namely, Vṛiddhi, and remain in the cases of Guna unaltered, unless extraordinary grounds of exception occur. It may be convenient here to give a connected summary of the results produced by Guna and Vṛiddhi.

Primitive Vowels,	अ *a,*	आ *â,*	इ *i,*	ई *î,*	उ *u,*	ऊ *û,*	ऋ *ṛi*
Guna	...	...	ए *ê,*	ए *ê,*	ओ *ô,*	ओ *ô,*	अर् *ar,*
Vṛiddhi	आ *â,*	...	ऐ *âi,*	ऐ *âi,*	औ *âu,*	औ *âu,*	आर् *âr,**

Primitive Vowels,	ॠ *ṛî,*	ए *ê,*	ऐ *âi,*	ओ *ô,*	औ *âu.*
Guna	अर् *ar,*	...	...	...	...
Vṛiddhi	आर् *âr,*	ऐ *ai,*	...	औ *âu,*	...

30. We now proceed to the exposition of the Zend writing, which, like the Semitic, proceeds from right to left, and towards the comprehension of which Rask has contributed valuable corrections, which give the language an appearance more natural and more in consonance with the Sanskṛit than it assumed in the hands of former commentators, Anquetil's pronunciation having admitted much that was heterogeneous, especially in the vowels. We follow the order of the Sanskṛit

---

* According to original Grammars the Guna letters are *a, e, o;* the Vṛiddhi, *â, ai, au;* the two first, *a* and *â,* being severally substituted for the vowel sounds of *ṛi, lṛi,* in combination with the semi-vowels *r* and *l,* as *ar, al, âr, âl.*—*Editor.*

alphabet in giving the corresponding value of each letter in [G. Ed. p. 30.] the Zend. The Sanskṛit short अ *a* has two, or rather three, representatives; the first is 𐬀, which Anquetil pronounces as *a* or *e*, but Rask, certainly with truth, limits to *a*. The second is 𐬆, which Rask pronounces like the short *æ* of the Danish, or like the short German *ä*, as in *Hände*, or as *a* in *cane* in English, and *e* in the French *après*. I consider this 𐬆 as the shortest vowel, and write it *ĕ*. We often find it inserted between two consonants which form a double consonant in the Sanskṛit; for instance, 𐬛𐬀𐬛𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬱𐬀 *dadarĕśa* (pret. redupl.), for the Sanskṛit ददर्श *dadarśa*, "he" or "I saw;" 𐬛𐬀𐬛𐬆𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬍 *dadĕmahî* (V. S. p. 102), "we give," for the Vêda form दद्मसि *dadmasi*. This shortest *ĕ* is also always appended to an originally terminating *r*. Thus, for instance, 𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆 *antarĕ*, "between," 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆 *dâtarĕ*, "giver," "creator," 𐬓𐬀𐬭𐬆 *hvarĕ*, "sun," stand for the corresponding Sanskṛit forms अन्तर् *antar*, दातर् *dâtar*, स्वर् *swar*, "heaven." It is worthy also of remark, that always before a final 𐬨 *m*, and generally before a final 𐬥 *n*, and frequently before an intermediate vowelless 𐬧 *n*, the older अ *a* becomes 𐬆 *ĕ*. Compare, for instance, 𐬞𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬆𐬨 *puthrĕ-m*, "*filium*" with पुत्रम् *putra-m;* 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬆𐬥 *aṇh-ĕn*, "they were," with आसन् *âsan*, ἦσαν; 𐬵𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬆𐬨 *hĕnt-ĕm*, "the existing one," with सन्तम् *sant-am*, *præ-sentem*, *ab-sentem*. This retro-active influence of the nasal reminds us of the shortening power of the Latin termination *m;* as, for instance, *stĕm*, *stêmus* (Sanskṛit तिष्ठेयम् *tiṣhṭhêy-am*, तिष्ठेम *tiṣhṭhêma*).

31. Anquetil entirely refuses to admit into his alphabet a letter differing but little from the 𐬆 *ĕ* above discussed, but yet distinct from it by rule in practice, namely, 𐬈, which Rask teaches us to pronounce like a long Danish *æ*. We find this letter usually in connection with a following 𐬎 *u*, and this vowel appears to admit, with the exception [G. Ed. p. 31.] of the long 𐬁 *â*, no vowel but this 𐬈 before it. We write this 𐬈 *e* without the diacritic sign, inasmuch as we represent the 𐬉, like the Sanskṛit ए, by *ê*. *Eu* 𐬈𐬎 corresponds etymo-

logically to the Sanskrit ओ *ô*, or diphthong formed by अ *a* and उ *u;* thus, for example, the nominal bases in *u*, which in the Sanskrit genitive, by the influence of Guna, *i.e.* by the prefixing of a short *a*, make *ô-s*, form, in Zend, 𐬆𐬎𐬯 *eus*. Compare, for instance, 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬆𐬎𐬯 *paśeus* with पशोस् *paśôs*, from *paśu*, "*pecus*." And yet the Sanskrit *ô* does not universally become *eu* in Zend, but often remains as it is, and specially in cases where it arises out of the termination *as*, by the solution of the *s* into *u*. According to its pronunciation, 𐬆𐬎 *eu* would appear to be a diphthong, and to form but one syllable, as in our German words *heute*, *Leute*, &c. The long *a* (*â*) is written 𐬁.

32. Short and long *i* are represented, as are long and short *u*, by special characters, 𐬌 *i*, 𐬍 *î*, 𐬎 *u*, 𐬏 *û:* Anquetil, however, gives to the short *i* the pronunciation *e*, and to the short *u* (𐬎) that of *o;* while, according to Rask, only 𐬊 is pronounced as short *o*.* This short *o* frequently holds the etymological place of the Sanskrit उ *u*, and never corresponds to any other Sanskrit vowel. For the diphthong औ *âu*, in particular, we have generally the Zend 𐬂 *âo:* we yet find, sometimes, also 𐬁𐬎 *âu;* for instance, 𐬔𐬁𐬎𐬯 *gâus*, "*bos*," is more frequent than 𐬔𐬂𐬯 *gâos*, for the Sanscrit गौस् *gâus*.

33. The Sanskrit diphthong *ê*, formed out of *a*+*i*, is represented by 𐬉, which, especially as a terminating letter, is also written 𐬈, and which we, as in Sanskrit, represent by *ê*. We must here, however, observe, that the Sanskrit ए *ê* is not always preserved as 𐬉 *ê* in the Zend, but is sometimes replaced by 𐬋𐬌 *ôi*, which appears to prevail particularly after a preceding 𐬌𐬌 *y*, especially at the end of [G. Ed. p. 32.] words. The Vriddhi diphthong ऐ *âi* (out of *â*+*i*) is always represented by 𐬁𐬌 *âi;* *ô*, either by the equivalent 𐬋—for which we often find 𐬊 *o* substituted by the neglect of copyists—or by the above-mentioned 𐬆𐬎 *eu*, which, according to rule, before a terminating 𐬯 *s* replaces the Indian ओ *ô;*

---

* But see §. 447. Note.

so that a termination in 𐬋𐬯 *ôs** is unheard of in the Zend. For the Vṛiddhi diphthong औ *âu* (out of *â* + *u*) we generally find *âo*, for which there is a special character 𐬂; more rarely 𐬁𐬎 *âu*. It would appear that 𐬁𐬌 *âi*, 𐬂 *aô*, 𐬁𐬎 *âu*, and the 𐬋𐬌 *ôi* which replaces 𐬉 *ê*, should be pronounced as diphthongs, *i.e.* as monosyllables.

34. Anuswâra and Visarga do not exist in Zend, unless we admit the nasal specified in §. 61. as answering to the sound of the Sanskṛit Anuswâra. We proceed meanwhile, for the present, to the proper consonants. The first letter of the Sanskṛit guttural class has divided itself into two characters bearing reference to different functions, 𐬐 and 𐬑; of which the first, which we represent by *k*, only appears before vowels and 𐬬 *v;* the other, which we write *c*, precedes especially consonants, excepting 𐬬 *v*. Compare, for instance, 𐬐𐬋 *kô*, 𐬐𐬁 *kâ*, 𐬐𐬀𐬝 *kaṭ*, (*quis, quæ, quid*), 𐬵𐬀𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬝 *hakĕrĕṭ*, "once," 𐬐𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬙𐬌 *karôiti*, "he made," 𐬐𐬬𐬀 *kva*, "where," with को *kô*, का *kâ*, किम् *kim*, सकृत् *sakṛit*, करोति *karôti*, and क्व *kwa:* on the other hand, 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬀 *csathra*, "king," with क्षत्र *kṣhatra;* 𐬵𐬌𐬑𐬙𐬌 *hicti*, "pouring out" (V. S. p. 198), with सिक्ति *sikti* (from सिच् *sich*). In what manner the pronunciation of this 𐬑 *c* differs from that of the 𐬐 *k* can indeed hardly be defined with certainty: it is probably softer, weaker than that of the 𐬐 *k*, which latter is fenced in by no strong consonants. Rask selects for it the character *q*, without observing that this letter prefers only to precede consonants, and in this position [G. Ed. p. 33.] always corresponds to the Sanskṛit क *k*. Burnouf considers 𐬑 as an aspirate, and writes 𐬙𐬀𐬑𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬉 *takhmahê*. He writes, on the other hand, the letter 𐬓, which Rask treats as an aspirate, with *q*. Burnouf has not yet given his reason, which I think, however, I can guess, namely, that 𐬑 *c* is found before *r*, which, according to Burnouf's just

---

* 𐬋𐬯 *ôs*, according to Burnouf, occurs occasionally as the termination of the genitive singular of the *u*-bases for the more common 𐬈𐬎𐬯 *eus;* *e.g.* 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬀𐬋𐬯 *bâzaôs*, "*brachii.*"

remark, generally confers an aspirate upon a preceding consonant. I consider this reason, however, as insufficient; and think that 𐬑 *c* stands before *r*, because, as we have before remarked, all consonants, *v* excepted, only admit before them that modification of the *k* sound which is expressed by 𐬑. It would be impossible for 𐬭 *r*, and the other letters of similar agency, to convey aspiration to the preceding hard guttural if ख् *kh* be not extant in Zend; so that, for instance, the root खन् *khan*, "to dig," sounds 𐬐𐬀𐬥 *kan* in Zend. There are, however, some words in which ख् *kh* is represented by 𐬑. From खर *khara*, "ass," we find the accusative 𐬑𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬨 *carĕm;* and we find, also, the ख् *kh* of सखि *sakhi*, "friend," replaced by *c;* the accusative, for instance, सखायम् *sakhâyam* transformed into 𐬵𐬀𐬑𐬁𐬌𐬨 *hacâim*. It may therefore remain a question whether 𐬐 *k* or 𐬑 *c*, in respect of their sounds, have the better right to be referred to ख् *kh;* but this much is certain, that क् *k* before vowels and before व् *v* is only represented by 𐬐 in Zend; before other consonants only by 𐬑; which latter we shall, till better advised, continue to render by *c*.

35. Anquetil ascribes to 𐬑 the value of 𐬓, and to both the pronunciation *kh;* while Rask considers the latter alone, by reason of the aspiration stroke which he recognises, as aspirated, and compares it to the Spanish *x* and the Arabic خ, and our German *ch*. Burnouf renders [G. Ed. p. 34.] 𐬓 by *q;* and observes (l. c. p. 345) that the Sanskrit syllable स्व *swa* becomes *qa* in Zend, namely, in स्वप्न *swapna*, "sleep," written, according to Burnouf, *qafna*, and in स्व *swa* (*suus*), "his." We are inclined to add to these examples, 𐬓𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 *khanha*, (nom.) accus. 𐬓𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬭𐬆𐬨 *khanhrĕm*, from स्वसा *swasâ*, "sister" (*soror*); स्वसारम् *swasâram* (*sororem*); and 𐬓𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬋 *kharĕno*, "splendour," as related to स्वर् *swar*, "heaven," and सुर् *sur*, "to shine." We must, however, at the same time, remark, that स्व् *sw* does not universally become 𐬓 *kh*, and that स्व *swa* in particular, in an isolated position and with a possessive signification, much oftener appears in the shape of 𐬵𐬬𐬀 *hva*,

or that of 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬀 *hava*. We render 𐬓 by *kh*, and support our view of its aspiration more on the fact, that in modern Persian it corresponds frequently to خ, our *ch*, than on the circumstance that Rask has marked it as aspirated. This modern Persian خ is pronounced, indeed, at present, without aspiration, like an Italian *c* before *a, o, u;* but its value in Arabic, and the choice of this letter, so powerfully aspirated in the Arabic to designate a special guttural sound, in true Persian words, seems to indicate an intrinsic stronger or milder aspiration. As 𐬓 *kh* is derived from the Sanskrit स्व *swa*, it was not applied to replace the क *k* before letters, which would without it produce an aspiration. It may also be here convenient to remember that either *u* or *v* (و) accompanies the Persian خ when the latter replaces at the beginning of a [G. Ed. p. 35.] word the Sanskrit स्व *sw*. It is true that و *v* is no longer sounded before long vowels, but it must originally have had its influence on the pronunciation, and cannot have been introduced into writing entirely without object, and for the mere employment of the copyist. Compare خدا *khudâ*, "God," with स्वदत्त *swadatta*, "self-given;" for which, in Zend, we have, under a more regular participial form (see Gramm. Crit. r. 608), 𐬓𐬀𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀 *khadâta**; which Anquetil, or his Pârsî teacher, always understands in the sense of, "given through God," deceived, probably, by the resemblance of sound to خدا *khudâ;* while Neriosengh properly translates it by स्वयन्दत्त *swayandatta*. The Persian خدا *khudâ* is, however, as Burnouf correctly assumes, actually related to the Zend 𐬓𐬀𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀 *khadâta*, so as to have its name based in the idea, "created by itself," while in its form it has been mutilated of one syllable. In Sanskrit we find both स्वभू *swabhû*, "self-existent," and also the more common स्वयम्भू *swayambhû*, as appellations of Brahma and Vishṇu. That, however, as has often been maintained, our word "God" is really related to

---

* This word comes from the root *dhâ*, "to place," not from *dâ*, "to give," see §. 637.

خدا *khudâ*, and that its primal signification has thus been discovered through the Zend, we are forced still to doubt. We will here only call to mind that the Germanic forms, especially in the older dialects, in general approximate much more to the Sanskṛit than to the modern Persian. स्व् *sw*, in particular, in the Gothic, either remains unaltered, or becomes *sl* (§. 20.). The pronominal syllable स्व *swa* exhibits itself in the Gothic as a pronominal adverb, *sva* (*so*) "thus;" and with an instrumental form, *svĕ* (*wie*) "how." The neuter substantive *svês* (Theme *svêsa*) means *Eigenthum*, "property," as in Sanskṛit the neuter स्व *swa*. I know of no certain form in which a Germanic *g* or *k* corresponds to a Sanskṛit स्व् *sw* or a Persian خ *kh*. To return, however, to the [G. Ed. p. 36.] Persian خُ *khu* = स्व् *sw*: compare خفتن *khuftan*, "to sleep," with स्वप् *swap*; خواب *kh*(*w*)*âb*, "sleep," with स्वाप *swâpa*; خواندن *kh*(*w*)*ândan*, "to sing," with स्वन् *swan*, "to sound;" خواهر *kh*(*w*)*âhar*, "sister," with स्वसृ *swasṛi*, Gothic *svistar*; خرشيد *khur-shîd*, "sun," Zend 𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬆 *hvarĕ*, with स्वर् *swar*, "heaven." In some words خ *kh* corresponds to a Sanskṛit *k* before *r*, in which position the Zend loves an aspiration; in the modern Persian, however, a vowel intrudes between the guttural and the *r*; thus, خراميدن *khirâm-îdan*, "to proceed with pomp," corresponds to the Sanskṛit क्रम् *kram*, "to go," "to step;" and خريدن *khirîdan*, "to buy," to the Sanskṛit equivalent root क्री *krî*. The Persian خ *kh* answers to the Sanskṛit aspirated ख् *kh*, in the word خر *khar*, "ass" (Sanskṛit खर *khara*).

36. The guttural ग्, and its aspirate घ्, are represented by 𐬔 *g* and 𐬖 *gh*. The Sanskṛit घ् *gh* has, however, sometimes dismissed the aspiration in Zend; at least 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬨𐬀 *garĕma*, "heat" (*θέρμη* and *Wärme*), answers to the Sanskṛit घर्म *gharma*: on the other hand, the 𐬖𐬥𐬀 *ghna* in 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬖𐬥𐬀 *vĕrĕthraghna*, "victorious," corresponds to the Sanskṛit घ्न *ghna* at the end of compounds; for instance, in शत्रुघ्न *śatru-ghna*, "enemy slayer." The Zend 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬖𐬥𐬀 *vĕrĕthraghna* properly signi-

fies, like the word so often used in the same sense 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬥 *vĕrĕthra-zan*, "killer of Vṛitra," and proves a connection between the Zendish and Indian mythologies, which, however, in consequence of the obscuration of meanings in Zend, and the oblivion of the old Myths, now only exists in affinities of speech. "Killer of Vṛitra" is one of the most usual titles of honour of the prince of the lesser gods, or Indra, who, from his slaughter of the dæmon Vṛitra, of the race of the Dâ- [G. Ed. p. 37.] nawas, bears this name.

We shall discuss the nasals apart in §. 60.

37. Of the Sanskṛit palatals the Zend has only the *tenuis;* namely 𐬗 *ch* (= च्), and the *media*, namely 𐬘 *j* (= ज्): the aspirates are wanting, which is not surprising, as they are of rare occurrence in the Sanskṛit. The following are examples: 𐬗𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *charaiti*, "he goes," Sanskṛit चरति *charati;* 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬬𐬁𐬭𐬋 *chathwârô*, "four" (nom. plur. masc.) Sansk. चत्वारस् *chatwâras*, चत्वारो *chatwârô;* 𐬀𐬊𐬘𐬋 *aŏjô*, "strength," Sansk. ओजस् *ôjas*, ओजो *ôjô*. It is, however, to be observed, that, while the Sanskṛit *ch* remains, by rule, unaltered in Zend, the sonant *j* is often replaced by other letters; and first, by 𐬰 *z;* for instance, 𐬰𐬁𐬙𐬀 *zâta*, "born," Sansk. जात *jâta;* secondly, by 𐬱 *sh*; for instance, 𐬱𐬆𐬥𐬎 *shĕnu*, "knee," Sansk. जानु *jânu*.

38. The modification of the sounds of *t*, peculiar to the Sanskṛit, contained in the third row of consonants, is wanting in the Zend. We pass, therefore, to the ordinary sounds of that letter, the dentals. These are, 𐬙 *t* (त्), 𐬚 *th* (थ्), 𐬛 *d* (द्) 𐬜 *dh* (ध्), together with a *ṭ* (𐬝), peculiar to the Zend, of which more hereafter. The 𐬙 *t* is like the guttural which we represent by *k* (𐬐), in this respect, that its position is almost limited to one preceding vowels. Before 𐬭 *r* and 𐬬 *w*, and sometimes before 𐬫 *y*, in order to gratify the affection of the latter for an aspirate, the aspirated 𐬚 *th* steps in. Thus, for instance, 𐬚𐬬𐬄𐬨 *thwaṅm* signifies "thee," while the nominative is written 𐬙𐬏𐬨 *tûm*, and the genitive 𐬙𐬀𐬬𐬀 *tava;* and the word 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭 *âtar*, "fire," nom. 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬱

âtars, makes, after rejection of the *a* which preceded *r*, 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬉 *âthrê*, "*igni*," 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬝 *âthraṭ*, "*ab igne*," &c. If, however, the *t* be protected by a preceding consonant, excepting *ṅ*, the succeeding semi-vowel is thereby de- [G. Ed. p. 38.] prived of its retro-active power. We find, for instance, 𐬬𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬭𐬀 *vaśtra*, not 𐬬𐬀𐬯𐬚𐬭𐬀 *vaśthra*, "garment," "vest;" but we have 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬭𐬀 *maṅthra*, "speech," not 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬭𐬀 *maṅtra*, from the root 𐬨𐬀𐬥 *man*. At the end of a word, and, which rarely occurs, before strong consonants, (§. 25.) at the beginning also, and middle of a word, the Sanskrit *t* (त्) is represented by a special letter, namely, by 𐬝, which we, with Burnouf, write *ṭ*, but formerly wrote with a simple *t* undotted below, because no change is possible with 𐬙 or 𐬚. Rask represents it by *th*, because he recognises the sign of aspiration. I am unable, however, to assent to the universal validity of this sign of Rask's, and I incline to rejecting the aspirate, as in Sanskrit, from the end of words. We should also remember that the diphthong *ê* is written 𐬈 as well as 𐬉; the last, which prevails at the end of words, with a stroke similar to that which distinguishes our 𐬝 from 𐬙. Before consonants, for instance, in the word 𐬝𐬐𐬀𐬉𐬱𐬋 *ṭkaêshô*, the sounding of *th* would be more precarious than that of *t*, in case this *th* did not somewhat partake of a sibilant sound. I think, however, that 𐬝 *ṭ* has merely a feebler pronunciation than 𐬙 *t*, and is, so to say, the last breathing of *t*; as, in Sanskrit, *s* and *r*, at the end of words, are diluted to Visarga (§. 11.); and as त् *t*, in Prâkrit, and also in Greek, is, at the end of words, altogether suppressed.

39. 𐬛 is the ordinary *d* द्, and 𐬜 according to Rask's just remark, its aspirate *dh*. This represents the Sanskrit ध् *dh*, for instance, in the imperative ending धि. The Zend, moreover, favours 𐬜 *dh* for 𐬛 *d* in the middle of words between two vowels. We find, for instance, 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀 *dâta*, "given," but 𐬛𐬀𐬜𐬁𐬨𐬌 *dadhâmi*, Sanskrit ददामि *dadâmi*, "I give"; and 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬛𐬀𐬜𐬁𐬙𐬀 *mazda-dhâta*, [G. Ed. p. 39.]

"given by Ormusd," "created"; 𐬫𐬈𐬜𐬌 *yêdhi*, "if," Sanskrit यदि *yadi;* 𐬞𐬁𐬜𐬀 *pâdha*, "foot," Sansk. पाद *pâda.*

40. The labial class embraces the letters 𐬞 *p*, 𐬟 *f*, 𐬠 *b*, and the nasal of this organ 𐬨 *m*, of which more hereafter. 𐬞 *p* answers to the Sanskrit प *p*, and is transformed into 𐬟 *f* by the retro-active aspirative power of a following 𐬭 *r*, 𐬯 *s*, and 𐬥 *n;* whence, for instance, the preposition प्र *pra* (pro, πρό) becomes, in Zend, 𐬟𐬭𐬀 *fra;* and the primitive words 𐬀𐬞 *ap*, "water" (*aqua*, and perhaps ἀφρός), 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬞 *kĕrĕp*, "body," form in the nominative, 𐬁𐬟𐬯 *âfs*, 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬟𐬯 *kĕrĕfs;* on the other hand, in the accusative, 𐬁𐬞𐬆𐬨 *âpĕm*, 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬞𐬆𐬨 *kĕrĕpĕm*, or 𐬐𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬞𐬆𐬨 *kĕhrpĕm*. In regard to the power which resides in *n* of aspirating a *p*, compare 𐬙𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬎 *tafnu*, "burning," from the root 𐬙𐬀𐬞 *tap*, with the derivative from the same root 𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬞𐬀𐬫𐬈𐬌𐬙𐬌 *âtâpayêiti*, "he shines" (See Vendidâd Sâde, p. 333), and the plural 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬀 *csafna*, "nights," with the ablative singular 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬭𐬁𐬝 *csaparât* (Vendidâd Sâde, p. 330), in which, even in the root, the interchange between *n* and *r* is observable, as the same takes place in the Sanskrit between अहन् *ahan* and अहर् *ahar*, "day." (Gramm. Crit. r. 228. annot.) Originally—*i.e.* standing for itself, and not proceeding from the 𐬞 *p* by the influence described—𐬟 *f* is of very rare occurrence. In some instances known to me it corresponds to the Sanskrit भ *bh*, which, however, for the most part, in the Zend has rejected the aspiration. In Anquetil's Vocabulary we find *nâfo*, "navel," which in Sanskrit is written नाभि *nâbhi;* and in the fem. accus. plural, of frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, 𐬵𐬎𐬟𐬆𐬜𐬭𐬍𐬯 *hufĕdhrîs*, we recognise the Sanskrit सुभद्र *subhadra* "very fortunate," "very excellent," also a title of Vishnu.

41. We come now to the semi-vowels, and must, in order to follow the order of the Sanskrit alphabet, discuss *y* in the [G. Ed. p. 40.] next place, by which we express the sound of the German and Italian *j*, the English consonantal *y*. This

semi-vowel is written at the beginning of words by 𐬬 or 𐬡, and in the middle by the duplication of the *u* 𐬎𐬎, as in the Old High German we find *w* expressed. This semi-vowel, and the vowels which correspond to it, 𐬌 *i* and 𐬍 *í*, introduce into the preceding syllable an 𐬌 *i*; an interesting phenomenon, first observed by Burnouf (l. c. pp. 340, 341), and which in its principle is connected with the German vowel modification (§. 73.). We are obliged to ascribe a similar influence also to the diphthong 𐬉 *ê* where it stands at the end of a word. Frequent occasion for this presents itself in the dat. sing. and the third pers. pres. of the middle verb. For instance, 𐬥𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬉 *nairê*, "*homini*," for 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬉 *narê*, is frequent; but 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬉𐬗𐬀 *naraêcha*, "*hominique*," is an exception. The vowels after which, by the attractive power of the letters mentioned, an 𐬌 *i* is placed, are 𐬀 *a*, 𐬁 *â*, 𐬎 *u*, 𐬏 *û*, 𐬉 *ê*, 𐬋 *ô*, as to which we must also observe, that *u*, in the case of a succeeding *i*, is lengthened. Examples are: 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬜𐬫𐬀 *maidhya* (मध्य *madhya*) "middle"; 𐬥𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬫𐬀 *nairya*, "man"; 𐬠𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *bavaiti*, "he is"; 𐬛𐬀𐬜𐬁𐬌𐬙𐬌 *dadhâiti*, "he gives"; 𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬞𐬀𐬫𐬉𐬌𐬙𐬌 *âtâpayêiti*, "he shines"; 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬋𐬌𐬙𐬌 *kĕrĕnôiti*, "he makes"; 𐬯𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬜𐬌 *stûidhi*, "praise," instead of 𐬯𐬙𐬎𐬜𐬌 *studhi*, from the root 𐬯𐬙𐬎 *stu* (स्तु); 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬫𐬀 *tûirya*, "the fourth," from चतुर् *chatur*, with the च *cha* suppressed *; 𐬁𐬵𐬎𐬌𐬭𐬫𐬀 *âhuirya*, an adjective, derived from 𐬀𐬵𐬎𐬭𐬀 *ahura*. With regard to the influence of 𐬫 *y* we must observe, that it does not mix up an 𐬌 *i* with a vowel immediately preceding, but only with one separated from it by one consonant; for if there be two, unless the first be 𐬧 *n*, the retroactive power of *y*, *i*, or *í*, is neutralized; thus 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬌 *asti*, not 𐬀𐬌𐬯𐬙𐬌 *aisti*, stands for "he is"; on the other hand we have 𐬠𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬧𐬙𐬌 *bavainti*, Sansk. भवन्ति *bhavanti*, "they are." Several other consonants also resist simply [G. Ed. p. 41.] this power of attraction; thus we have 𐬛𐬀𐬑𐬫𐬎 *dakhyu*, not

---

* Or more immediately from the Sanskrit ordinal तुर्य्य *turyya* or तुरीय *turîya*, "fourth."—*Editor*.

𐬛𐬀𐬌𐬑𐬌𐬌𐬎𐬹 *daikhyu*, "land," "province"; and the *i* of the personal terminations 𐬨𐬌 *mi* and 𐬵𐬌 *hi*, or 𐬱𐬌 *shi*, obtain no influence over the preceding syllable. In the same manner, in the first person plural, 𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬌 *mahi*, not 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬵𐬌 *maihi*, corresponds to the Veda termination मसि *masi*; and in the genitive of the stems, or inflective bases, in 𐬀 *a*, 𐬀𐬵𐬉 *a-hê*, not 𐬀𐬌𐬵𐬉 *aihê*, stands for अस्य *a-sya*.

42. 𐬌𐬌 *y* sometimes also exerts that disturbing influence on a following 𐬀 *a* or 𐬁 *â*, which is equivalent to the insertion of a vowel, or of *i*, and consequently effects their transmutation into 𐬉 *ê**; thus the bases of nouns in

---

* The expression of the text is "äußert umlautenden Einfluss." It is hardly possible to render into English without circumlocution certain terms which the philologers of Germany have invented and adopted to express the various modifications of the Indo-Germanic vowel; such as, *Ablaut, Auflaut, Inlaut, Umlaut.* Whether these terms have in themselves the virtue of suggesting to a Teutonic ear the particular modification of the vowel to which they are respectively applied may be doubted; but if to the student and the teacher they answer the purpose of a *memoria technica*, their use is fully justified by the necessity of the case, and the practice of a language which possesses a singular and inexhaustible power of progress and adaptation to exigencies. In our language, it seems to us that the uncouthness of such compounds as Upsound, Offsound, and Insound, could hardly be compensated by any advantage to be derived from their use; and we therefore purpose, in the course of this work, where any of these terms occur in the original, to retain them in their German shape. Of these terms, *Ablaut* and *Umlaut* are those which chiefly, if not alone, are used by our author. *Inlaut* is, we believe, merely the Sanskṛit *Guna.* The meaning of the two former, and their distinction from each other, may best be explained by the following extract from our author's excellent work the Vocalismus, p. 10.

"I designate," he says, "by the term *Ablaut*, a change of the root vowel, which is distinguished from the *Umlaut* by the fact that it is not produced by the influence of the vowel of the termination; for *Umlaut* is a mere affection, disturbance (*Trübung*) of the primary sound, through which that sound becomes more homogeneous with the vowel of the termination; while in the *Ablaut*, without any *recognised* external cause, it makes room for another, and, in general, totally different sound; as in Gothic, *nima*, 'I take'; *nam*, 'I took.' I say, without any *recognised* external

𐬫𐬀 *ya* form, in the genitive, 𐬫𐬉𐬵𐬉 *yê-hê*, instead of 𐬫𐬀𐬵𐬉 *ya-hê*; and, with the verb, the old Sanskṛit य *ya* or या *yâ* of the fourth and tenth classes, in the present singular becomes 𐬫𐬉 *yê*. Compare 𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬨𐬌 *âtâpayêmi*, 𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬵𐬌 *âtâpayêhi*, 𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬌𐬙𐬌 *âtâpayêiti*, with the Sanskṛit आतापयामि *âtâpayâmi*, आतापयसि *âtâpayasi*, आतापयति *âtâpayati*. In the last syllable, 𐬌𐬌𐬀 *ya* before 𐬨 *m*, according to rule, becomes 𐬍 *î*; and after the same analogy, 𐬬𐬀𐬨 *vam* becomes 𐬏𐬨 *ûm*. We find, therefore, for instance, 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬍𐬨 *tûirîm*, "*quartum*," from 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬀 *tûirya*; and 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬱𐬏𐬨 *thrishûm*, "*tertiam partem*," 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬱𐬏𐬨 *chathrushûm*, "*quartam partem*," from 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬱𐬬𐬀 *thrishva*, 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬱𐬬𐬀 *chathrushva*. This appearance is to be thus understood, that the antecedent semi-vowel, after the suppression of the *a*, passes into its corresponding vowel, which, however, according to the rule of §. 64., must be a long one. The 𐬌𐬌 *y*[*], after its influence has transformed 𐬀 *a* into 𐬉 *e*, is often itself suppressed; thus we find 𐬟𐬭𐬁𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬯𐬀𐬉𐬨 *frâdaêsaêm*, "I shewed," from प्रादेशयम् *prâdêsayam*, which

---

ternal cause; because I think I can shew that the *Ablaut* also is produced by the particular quality and condition of the termination. Whether, however, we seek for the radical vowel in the present or the preterite, the change is equally one quite different from that of the Indian *Guna* or *Vṛiddhi*, and in this respect, that it is a positive change; while in Sanskṛit the root vowel is not in fact changed, but only receives an increment, and that increment always one and the same, with which it diphthongizes itself, as in Greek, ι and υ with ε, λειπω, φευγω. In respect of signification, likewise, there is a difference between the Indian *Guna* and *Vṛiddhi* and Germanic *Ablaut*; for the *Ablaut* has acquired for itself a significatory power for grammatical purposes, even if, as I conjecture, it did not originally possess such: the contrast between the present and the past seems to rest upon it, and there are indications that the latter is expressed by this change. In Sanskṛit, *Guna* and *Vṛiddhi* present no indication of this significatory power, but, merely in the character of diphthongizing modifications, accompany those inflections which do signify grammatical relations."

Further illustrations of these latter remarks are to be found in the Note 4, which Professor Bopp has appended to the above passage of the Vocalismus.—*Trans.*

[*] Cf. p. 963, Note.

according to the rule of the tenth class, would be formed from दिश् *diś*. The genitive termination स्य *sya* appears everywhere reduced into 𐬵𐬇 *hê*. The semi-vowels 𐬫 *y* and 𐬬 *v* are generally suppressed after preceding conso- [G. Ed. p. 42.] nants*; and thus, also, the imperative ending स्व *swa* gives up its *w*.

43. In Sanskrit, य् *y* is sometimes, for euphony, interposed between two vowels (Gram. Crit. rr. 271. 310. 311.); but this does not uniformly occur. In Zend, the interposition of *y* between 𐬎 *u*, 𐬏 *û*, and a following 𐬇 *ê*, seems to amount to a law. Thus the Sanskrit ब्रुवे *bruvê*, "I say" (from ब्रू and ए, Gram. Crit. r. 55.), becomes, in Zend, 𐬨𐬭𐬏𐬫𐬇 *mrûyê* (§. 63.); and the neuter form द्वे *dwê*, "two," after the vocalization of the *w* into *u*, takes the form 𐬛𐬎𐬫𐬇 *duyê*.

44. We have already remarked (§. 30.) with respect to 𐬭 *r*, that at the end of a word an 𐬆 *ĕ* is always appended to it; for instance, 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆 *dâtarĕ*, "Creator," "Giver"; 𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬆 *hvarĕ*, "Sun," instead of 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭 *dâtar*; 𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭 *hvar*. In the middle of a word, where an 𐬵 *h* is not introduced according to §. 48., the union of 𐬭 *r* with a following consonant is mostly avoided; so, indeed, that to the originally vowelless *r* an *ĕ* is appended: thence, for instance, 𐬛𐬀𐬛𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬯𐬀 *dadarĕśa*, from ददर्श *dadarśa*, "vidi," "vidit"; or the *r* is transposed, in the same manner as is usual in the Sanskrit for the avoidance of the union of र् *r* with two following consonants. (Gram. Crit. r. 34ᵇ.) Hence, for instance, 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬬𐬀 *âthrava*, "priests" (nominative), accus. 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬆𐬨 *âthravanĕm*, from the theme 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬥 *âtarvan*, which in the weak cases (§. 129.) contracts itself into 𐬁𐬚𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥 *âthurun* or 𐬁𐬚𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥 *âthaurun*. (§. 28.) To this, also, pertains the fact that polysyllabic stems (or uninflected bases) in 𐬀𐬭 *ar*, at the beginning of compounded forms, transpose this syllable into 𐬭𐬀 *ra*; and thus 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬀 *âthra*, "fire," stands instead of

---

* But see § 721.

𐬁𐬚𐬀𐬭 *âthar.** The combinations 𐬭𐬌𐬌 *ry*, [G. Ed. p. 43.] 𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬎 *urv*, are only permitted where a vowel follows, and the combination 𐬀𐬭𐬯 *ars* only as a termination, and in the middle of a word before 𐬙 *t*; for instance, 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬀 *tûirya*, "the fourth"; 𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬀 *vairya*, "strong"; 𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬥 *urvan*, "soul" 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬎𐬀 *haurva*, "whole" (?); 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬯 *âtars*, "fire" (nominative); 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬯 *nars*, "of a man"; 𐬵𐬀𐬭𐬯𐬙𐬀 *harsta*, "ploughed"; but 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬯 *chathrus*, "four times," for 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬎𐬭𐬯 *chathurs*, since here no *a* precedes the *rs*.

45. It is worthy of remark, that in the Zend the *l* is wanting, as in Chinese the *r*, while, nevertheless, it exists in the modern Persian, and shews itself in words which are not of Semitic origin. The Sanskrit व् *v* has three representatives in the Zend, 𐬬, 𐬎𐬎, and 𐬡. The two first are so far distinguished from each other in their use, that 𐬬 corresponds to the Sanskrit *v* only at the beginning, and 𐬎𐬎 only in the middle of words; for instance, 𐬬𐬀𐬉𐬨 *vaêm*, "we," = वयम् *vayam*, 𐬙𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 *tava* (*tui*) = तव *tava*. This distinction, as Rask justly assumes, is only graphic. 𐬡, which I, with Burnouf, render by *w*, most frequently occurs after 𐬚 *th*, so that 𐬎𐬎 never accompanies an antecedent 𐬚 *th*. On the other hand we find 𐬎𐬎 much oftener than 𐬡 after the aspirated medials of this class. Perhaps the law here obtains that the 𐬜 *dh*, which, according to §. 39., stands for 𐬛 *d* (द्), is only followed by 𐬎𐬎, while an original 𐬜 *dh*, corresponding to a Sanskrit ध् *dh*, only appears in conjunction with 𐬡. Thus 𐬛𐬀𐬜𐬎𐬎𐬃 *dadhvâo*, "having created," "given," from the root 𐬛𐬁 *dâ*†, answers to the Sanskrit nom. दद्वान् *dadwân*; while the accusative, of frequent occurrence in the Vendidâd, 𐬀𐬜𐬡𐬁𐬥𐬆𐬨 *adhwânĕm*, seems to be identical with the Sanskrit अध्वानम् *adhwânam*, "*viam*." (Vend. Olsh. p. 18.) After other consonants than

---

* By *Stämme*, the author here evidently means the crude derivative words which serve as Stems or Bases to inflected words, or those in combination with inflectional terminations; thus *âthra* for *âthar*, forms *âthrava*, *âthravanĕm*, not *âtharva*, *âtharvanam*, &c.—*Editor.*

† The root corresponds to the Sanskrit *dhâ*, see §. 637.

𐬚 *th* and 𐬜 *dh*, 𐬬 *w* appears not to be admitted, but only 𐬎 *v*; on the other hand, 𐬬 *w* much prevails between two *i*'s or 𐬌 *i* and 𐬫 *y*, in which position 𐬎 *v* is not allowed. [G. Ed. p. 44.] Thus we read in the Vendidâd (Olsh. p. 23), the nominatives 𐬛𐬭𐬌𐬬𐬌𐬯 *driwis*, "beggar," (?) and 𐬛𐬀𐬌𐬬𐬌𐬯 *daiwis*, "a worshipper of Daêva." 𐬛𐬀𐬌𐬬𐬌𐬯 *daiwis* however, as derived from *daêva* through the suffix 𐬌 *i*, seems to me dubious, and I prefer the variation 𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬎𐬌𐬯 *daêvis*. Or is it between *ê* and *i* also that 𐬬 *w* only can be allowed? Another instance is, 𐬀𐬌𐬬𐬫𐬋 *aiwyô*, "*aquis*," as dative and ablative plural; an interesting form which long remained a mystery to me, but which I am now in condition to explain. It springs from the root 𐬀𐬞 *ap*, "water" in such a manner, that after suppression of the *p*,* the Sanskrit termination भ्यस् *bhyas*, which elsewhere, in the Zend, appears only as 𐬠𐬫𐬋 *byô*, has weakened itself to 𐬬𐬫𐬋 *wyô*, and, according to §. 41., has introduced an 𐬌 *i* into the base. Another instance in which भ् *bh* has weakened itself in the Zend into a semi-vowel, and obtained the form 𐬬 *w* in virtue of its position between two 𐬌 *i*'s, is the very common preposition 𐬀𐬌𐬬𐬌, *aiwi*, for which, however, 𐬀𐬌𐬠𐬌 *aibi* is sometimes substituted. It may be appropriate here to remark that भ् *bh* appears in the Zend, in other company, in the enfeebled shape of 𐬎 *v*. We find, namely, the base उभ *ubha*, "both," not only in the shape 𐬎𐬠𐬀 *uba*, but also in that of 𐬀𐬊𐬎𐬀 *aova* (§. 28.), the neuter dual form of which I think I recognise in the Vend. S. p. 88., where 𐬀𐬊𐬎𐬉 𐬫𐬀𐬯𐬥𐬋 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬱𐬉 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬉 *aovê yasnô amĕshê spĕntê*, can hardly signify any thing else than "*ambos* † *venerans Amschaspantos*" (*non conniventes Sanctos*, see Nalus, vv. 25, 26.) Anquetil interprets (T. 3, p. 472.) *ovê*, by "*tous deux*." We have still another position to mention, in which [G. Ed. p. 45.] the semi-vowel 𐬬 *w* appears, namely, before 𐬭 *r*, in which connection the softer *w* is more appropriate than the harder 𐬎𐬎 *v*. The only example of this case is the feminine 𐬯𐬎𐬡𐬭𐬁 *šuwrâ*, "sword," "dagger," in which we believe we recognise the Sanskrit शुभ्र *śubhra*, "shining,"* As to the pronunciation of the 𐬡 *w*, I think, with Burnouf, that it accords with the English *w*, which also is akin to the Sanskrit व् *v* after consonants. Rask reverses the powers, pronouncing the Zend 𐬡 as the English *v*, and the letters 𐬬 and 𐬎𐬎 as the English *w*.

---

* Compare, in this respect, अभ्र *abhra*, "cloud," for अब्भ्र *ab-bhra*, "water-bearing," and the Zend 𐬁𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬀 *â-bĕrĕta*, nom. "water-bearer."

† Burnouf reads *aôi* (*i.e.* "over") and makes *yasne*, signify "reverence."

46. I have not detected in the *v* and *w* a power of attraction similar to that which belongs to the 𐬫 *y*, as described in §. 41., unless the term 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬎𐬀 *haurva*, "all," which often occurs, as well as 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬞𐬀 *vîśpa*, is derived from the Sanskrit सर्व *sarwa*, "all." I have, however, already elsewhere ascribed to the corresponding vowel 𐬎 *u* a power of attraction, howbeit sparingly exerted; in virtue of which, for instance, the base 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬥 *âtarvan*, "priests," in the weak cases (see §. 129.), after that 𐬬𐬀𐬥 *van* has contracted itself into 𐬎𐬥 *un*, by the influence of this *u*, also converts the *a* of the preceding syllable into *u*; hence, for instance, in the dative, 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬉 *âtaurunê* for 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬉 *âtarunê*. The Sanskrit तरुण *taruṇa*, "young," is, in Zend, 𐬙𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬀 *turuna* or 𐬙𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬀 *tauruna* (§. 28.); and वसु *vasu*, "thing," "riches," [G. Ed. p. 46.] has, by the influence of the concluding *u*, converted itself into 𐬬𐬋𐬵𐬎 *vôhu*.

47. Burnouf was the first to remark on the fact, peculiar to the Zend, that the semi-vowels are fond of communicating an aspiration to a preceding consonant; and we (§. 40.) have ascribed a similar influence to 𐬯 *s* and 𐬥 *n*, and find ourselves compelled to assign the same also to the

---

* The accusative 𐬯𐬎𐬡𐬭𐬄𐬨 *śuwraṁm*, appears in Olshausen, p. 13, with the variation 𐬯𐬎𐬟𐬭𐬄𐬨 *śufraṁm*. (§. 40.) Then we often find the instrumental 𐬯𐬎𐬡𐬭𐬫𐬀 *śuwrya*, for which, however, we must read 𐬯𐬎𐬡𐬭𐬀𐬫𐬀 *uwraya*, if *śuwrya* be not derivable from a Theme 𐬯𐬎𐬡𐬭𐬍 *śuwrî*, after the analogy of सुन्दरी *sundarî*, from सुन्दर *sundara*. (Gramm. Crit. r. 270.)

labial nasal, by which, for instance, the feminine participle जग्मुषी *jagmushî* has changed itself to 𐬘𐬀𐬖𐬨𐬏𐬱𐬍 *jaghmûshî.* The dental medial is free from this influence, for we find 𐬛𐬬𐬀 *dva,* "two," 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬗𐬱 *drucs,* "a demon," (accus. 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘𐬆𐬨 *drujĕm,*) not 𐬜𐬭𐬎𐬗𐬱 *dhrucs,* 𐬜𐬭𐬎𐬘𐬆𐬨 *dhrujĕm.* The guttural medial is, however, exposed to this influence, as in the abovementioned instance of *jaghmûshi.* We have, on the other hand, adduced, in §. 38., a limitation of this appearance. The aspirating virtue of the 𐬫 *y* is less potent than that of the 𐬭 *r* and 𐬬 *w*, and we find *y* often preceded by the unaspirated *t*; for instance, in 𐬠𐬌𐬙𐬫𐬀 *bitya,* "the second," 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬙𐬫𐬀 *thritya,* "the third": on the other hand, we have 𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬫𐬎 *mĕrĕthyu,* "death," Sansk. मृत्यु *mrityu.*

48. In connection with the above rule stands the phenomenon, that before *r,* when followed by any consonant not a sibilant, an *h* is usually placed; for instance 𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬀 *mahrka,* "death," from the root 𐬨𐬀𐬭 *mar* (मृ *mri,*) "to die"; 𐬐𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬞𐬆𐬨 *kehrpĕm,* or 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬞𐬆𐬨 *kĕrĕpĕm,* "the body" (nom. 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬟𐬱 *kĕrĕfs*); 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬀 *vĕhrka,* or 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬐𐬀 *vĕrĕka,* "wolf," (वृक *vrika.*) The semi-vowel *y* also, which only appears before vowels, sometimes attracts an 𐬵 *h*; thus, 𐬚𐬬𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬀 *thwahya,* "through thee," corresponds to the Sanskrit त्वया *twayâ*; and the word 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬀 *csahya* (nom. 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬋 [G. Ed. p. 47.] *csahyô* adduced by Rask, stands for 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬫𐬀 *csaya* and comes from the root 𐬑𐬱𐬌 *csi,* "to rule," (क्षि *kshi.*)

49. We come now to the sibilants. The first, a palatal, pronounced in Sanskrit with a gentle aspiration, श, which we express by *ś* in Sanskrit, and *ś* in Zend, is written 𐬯 in the latter. Its exact pronunciation is scarcely ascertainable. Anquetil assigns it that of the ordinary *s.* It in general occurs in those positions in which the Sanskrit in corresponding words has its श *ś*; thus, for instance, *daśa,* "ten," *śata,* "hundred," *paśu,* "beast," are common to both languages. In this respect 𐬯 *ś* has spread itself wider in Zend than in Sanskrit; that before several consonants,

namely, 𐬙 *t*, 𐬐 *k*, and 𐬥 *n*, as well at the beginning as in the middle of words—in the latter place, however, only after 𐬀 *a*, 𐬁 *â*, and 𐬄 *aṅ*—it corresponds to the Sanskrit dental or ordinary *s* स्. Compare 𐬯𐬙𐬁𐬭𐬋 *śtârô*, "the stars," with स्तारस् *stâras*; 𐬯𐬙𐬁𐬊𐬨𐬌 *śtâômi*, "I praise," with स्तौमि *stâumi*; 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬌 *aśti*, "he is," with अस्ति *asti*; 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬄𐬨 *aśtaṅm*, "*ossium*," with अस्थि *asthi*; 𐬯𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬛𐬀 *śkanda*, "shoulder," (?) with स्कन्ध *skandha*; 𐬯𐬥𐬁 *śnâ*, "to purify," with स्ना *snâ*, "to bathe." We might infer from this circumstance that *ś* 𐬯 was pronounced as a simple *s*, yet it may have to do with a dialectical preference for the sound *sh*, as happens with the German *s* in the Suabian dialect, and pretty universally at the beginning of words before *t* and *p*. It is further to be remarked, that *ś* 𐬯 occurs also at the end of words after 𐬄 *aṅ*. The occasion for this presents itself in the nom. sing. masc. of bases in 𐬥𐬙 *nt*.

50. The semi-vowel 𐬬 *v* is regularly hardened into 𐬞 *p* after 𐬯 *ś*; hence, for instance, 𐬯𐬞𐬁 *śpâ*, "*canis*." 𐬯𐬞𐬁𐬥𐬆𐬨 *śpânĕm* "*canem*," 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬞𐬀 *vîśpa*, "all," [G. Ed. p. 48.] 𐬀𐬯𐬞𐬀 *aśpa*, "horse," corresponding to the Sanskrit श्वा *śwâ*, श्वानम् *śwânam*, विश्व *viśwa*, अश्व *aśwa*. 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬥𐬙𐬀 *śpenta*, "holy," is not corresponded to by a Sanskrit श्वन्त *śwanta*, which must have originally been in use, and which the Lithuanian *szanta-s* indicates. From the Zend 𐬀𐬯𐬞𐬀 *aśpa*, the transition is easy to the Greek ἵππος, which is less obvious in the case of the Indian *aśwa*.

51. For the Sanskrit lingual sibilant ष् *ṣh*, the Zend supplies two letters, 𐬱 and 𐬴. The first, according to Rask, is pronounced like the ordinary *s*, and therefore like the Sanskrit dental *s* स्; while 𐬴 has the sound of ष् = *ṣh*, and marks this by a stroke of aspiration. We therefore write it *sh*.* Rask observes that these two letters are often interchanged in MSS.; which he accounts for by the circumstance

---

* It is in this Translation given *sh* without any mark. *Ṣh* denotes the Sansk. ष.

that 𐬱 is used in the Pehlevi for *sh*, and that the Parsî copyists have been long better acquainted with the Pehlevi than the Zend. We find, also, in the Codex edited by Burnouf, 𐬱 almost everywhere corresponding to ष् *ṣh*. We recognise, however, from the text edited by Olshausen of a part of the Vendidâd, and the variations appended, that although in etymological respects 𐬱 as well as 𐬴 corresponds to the Sanskṛit ष् *ṣh*, the principal position of 𐬱 is before strong consonants (§. 25.) and at the end of words; a position of much importance in the Zend, and which requires attention in the cases of other classes of letters. In this respect 𐬱 resembles, among the dentals, 𐬝 *ṭ*, among the gutturals 𐬑 *c*, and among the nasals principally 𐬢 *ṅ*. At the end of words, indeed, 𐬱 *s* corresponds to the Sanskṛit स् *s*, but yet [G. Ed. p. 49.] only after such letters as, in the middle of a word, would, according to Rule 101(^{a}) of my Sanskṛit Grammar, change an original स् *s* into ष् *ṣh*; namely, after vowels other than *a* and *â*, and after the consonants 𐬑 *c* and 𐬭 *r*. Hence, for instance, the nominative 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬱 *paitis*, "Lord," 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎𐬱 *pasus*, "beast," 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬱 *âtars*, "fire," 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬑𐬱 *drucs*, "dæmon," from the theme 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘 *druj*. On the other hand, 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬅𐬯 *baraṅs*, "bearing," from 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬥𐬙 *barant*.* In the word 𐬑𐬱𐬬𐬀𐬱 *csvas*, "six," it is true a terminating 𐬱 *s* stands after *a*; but it does not here replace a Sanskṛit स् *s*, but the original ष् *ṣh* of षष् *ṣhaṣh*. As evidence of the use of 𐬱 *s* for ष् *ṣh* before strong consonants, we may adduce the very usual superlative suffix 𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬀 *ista* (*i.e.* ιστος), corresponding to the Sanskṛit इष्ठ *iṣhṭha*. Other examples are 𐬐𐬀𐬭𐬱𐬙𐬀 *karsta*, "ploughed," for कृष्ट *kṛiṣhṭa*. In the word 𐬱𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬥𐬀 *sayana* "camp," 𐬱 stands irregularly for 𐬯 *ś*, which latter was to be anticipated from the Sanskṛit शयन *śayana* (cf. *śaêtê*,- §. 54.) In the fem. numeral

---

* I retain here the original *t*, since the theme of the word does not appear in use. 𐬙 *t* must otherwise have been changed for 𐬝 *ṭ*.

𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬋 *tisarô*, "three" (Olsh. p. 26), the 𐬯 might seem questionable, for the Sanskṛit form is तिस्रस् *tisras*, and स् according to §. 53., becomes 𐬵 *h*. The स्, however, is here in a position (after इ *i*) in which the Sanskṛit favours the conversion of स् *s* into ष् *ṣh*; and on this rests the Zend form 𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬋 *tisarô*. That it does not, however, stand as 𐬙𐬌𐬱𐬀𐬭𐬋 *tisharô*, as we might expect from §. 52., is certainly not to be ascribed to the original existence of 𐬀 *a*, for 𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬋 *tisarô* stands for 𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬭𐬋 *tisrô*.

52. 𐬱 stands for the Sanskṛit ष् *ṣh* before vowels and the semi-vowels 𐬫 *y* and 𐬬 *v*; compare 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀𐬉𐬱𐬀𐬥𐬨 *aêtaêshanm* and 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀𐬉𐬱𐬬𐬀 *aêtaêshva*, with एतेषाम् *êtêṣhâm*, "*horum*," and एतेषु *êtêṣhu*, "*in his*"; 𐬨𐬀𐬱𐬫𐬀 *mashya*, "man," with मनुष्य *manuṣhya*. Yet 𐬱 *sh* does not unite itself with an antecedent 𐬑 *c*; but for the Sanskṛit क्ष् *kṣh* we find almost everywhere in Olshausen's text, and without variation, 𐬑𐬯 *cs*; hence, for instance, 𐬑𐬯𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬀 *csathra*, "king," Sanskṛit क्षत्र *kṣhatra*, "a man of the warlike or royal caste." The word of frequent occurrence, 𐬑𐬱𐬥𐬀𐬋𐬨𐬀 *cshnaôma*, and the third person connected with it, 𐬑𐬱𐬥𐬀𐬋𐬨𐬀𐬫𐬉𐬌𐬙𐬌 *cshnaômayêiti*, we must, on a double ground, reject, and prefer the variation given at p. 33, since 𐬯 *s* here is prolonged, as well by the preceding *c* as by the following *n*. It is, however, worthy of remark, that the Sanskṛit क्ष् *kṣh* in many Zend words abandons the guttural, and appears as 𐬱 *sh*. For instance, दक्षिण *dakṣhiṇa*, "*dexter*," becomes 𐬛𐬀𐬱𐬌𐬥𐬀 *dashina* (Lithuan. *dészinè*, "the right hand"), and अक्षि *akṣhi*, "eye," becomes 𐬀𐬱𐬌 *ashi*, which, however, seems only to occur at the end of possessive compounds (Bahuvrîhi). [G. Ed. p. 50.]

53. 𐬵 *h* is never, in etymological respects, the representative of the Sanskṛit ह् *h*, but of the pure and dental sibilant स् *s*. Before vowels, semi-vowels, and *m*, in Zend, this letter invariably becomes 𐬵, possibly because स्व् *sw* (§. 35.) takes the shape 𐬓 *kh*; while before *n*, and such consonants as cannot unite with a preceding *h*, (§. 49.) it is to be looked for in the shape of 𐬱 *ś*. The [G. Ed. p. 51.]

roots which begin with स्प् *sp* and स्फ् *sph* have not yet been detected by me in the Zend; but I am convinced that स्पृश् *spṛiś,* for instance, "to touch," could not begin otherwise in Zend than with 𐬳𐬞 *śp*. Compare, for instance—

ZEND.		SANSKṚIT.	
𐬵𐬁	*hâ,* "they,"	सा	*sâ.*
𐬵𐬀𐬞𐬙𐬀	*hapta,* "seven,"	सप्त	*sapta.*
𐬵𐬀𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬝	*hakĕrĕt,* "once,"	सकृत्	*sakṛit.*
𐬀𐬵𐬌	*ahi,* "thou art,"	असि	*asi.*
𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬁𐬌	*ahmâi,* "to this,"	अस्मै	*asmâi.*
𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬆	*hvarĕ,* "sun,"	स्वर्	*swar,* "heaven."
𐬵𐬬𐬀	*hva,* "his,"	स्व	*swa.*

The word 𐬵𐬌𐬰𐬬𐬀 *hizva,* "tongue," from जिह्वा *jihwa,* deserves mention, because the sibilant quality of the ज् *j* is treated as स् *s,* and replaced by 𐬵 *h* (§. 58.).

54. I do not remember to have met with an instance of the combination 𐬵𐬭 *hr;* the Sanskṛit word सहस्र *sahasra,* "thousand," which might give occasion for it, has rejected the sibilant in the last syllable, and taken the shape 𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬭𐬀 *hazaṇra.* If, in the word 𐬵𐬎𐬱𐬐𐬀 *huska,* "dry," Sansk. शुष्क *śushka,* 𐬵 replaces the Sansk. श् *ś,* we must remember that the Latin *siccus* indicates a Sansk. स *s,* because *c* regularly answers to श् *ś.* In many instances of Sanskṛit roots beginning with स् *s,* the corresponding Zend form may be grounded on the change which is effected on an initial स् *s* by the influence of certain prepositions. (Gram. Crit. r. 80.)

[G. Ed. p. 52.] Thus I believe I have clearly ascertained the existence of the Sanskṛit participle सिद्ध *siddha,* "perfected," in the term of frequent occurrence in the Vendidâd 𐬱𐬁𐬌𐬳𐬙𐬆𐬨 *shâiśtĕm;* after the analogy of 𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬳𐬙𐬀 *iriśta,* "deceased," from 𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬚 *irith* (see §. 99.) Olshausen notifies (p. 29) as variations of 𐬱𐬁𐬌𐬳𐬙𐬆𐬨 *shâiśtĕm* — 𐬯𐬁𐬌𐬳𐬙𐬆𐬨 *śâiśtĕm,* 𐬱𐬁𐬌𐬳𐬙𐬍𐬨 *shâiśtîm,* 𐬱𐬁𐬌𐬯𐬙𐬍𐬨 *shâistîm,* and 𐬱𐬁𐬌𐬯𐬙𐬆𐬨 *shâistĕm.* In all these forms, the long *a* presents a difficulty; for, according to §. 28., षिध *ṣhidh* would give the form 𐬱𐬀𐬌𐬜 *shaidh;* and this, with the suffix *ta,*

𐬴𐬀𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬀 *shaista*, in the nom. and accus. neut. 𐬴𐬁𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬆𐬨 *shâistĕm*. What Anquetil (vol. II. p. 279) translates, *Juste juge du monde qui existe par votre puissance, vous qui êtes la pureté même, quelle est la premiere chose qui plaise à cette terre* (*que nous habitons*), *et la rende favorable*, runs in the original (Olsh., p. 29, Burnouf, p. 137), -𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆 𐬔𐬀𐬉𐬚𐬀𐬥𐬄𐬨 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬥𐬄𐬨 𐬀𐬴𐬁𐬎𐬨 . 𐬐𐬬𐬀 𐬞𐬀𐬊𐬌𐬭𐬍𐬨 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬃 𐬰𐬆𐬨𐬋 𐬴𐬁𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬆𐬨° *Dâtarĕ gaêthanaňm astvaitinaňm ashâum! kva paoirîm anhâo zĕmô shâistĕm?* "*Creator mundorum existentium, pure! ubi* (*quid*) *primum hujus terræ perfectum* (*bonum?*")

55. The nominative pronominal base स्य *sya* (Gramm. Crit. r. 268), in the Veda dialect, is under the influence of the preceding word; and we see in Rosen's specimen, p. 6, this pronoun, when it follows the particle उ *u*, converted into ष्य *shya*, after the analogy of rule 101ᵃ of my Grammar. I have detected a similar phenomenon in the Zend pronouns; for we find 𐬵𐬉 *hê*, "*ejus*," "*ei*," which is founded on a lost Sanskrit से *sê* (cf. मे *mê*, "*mei*," "*mihi*," and ते *tê*, "*tui*," "*tibi*"), when it follows 𐬫𐬉𐬰𐬌 *yêzi*, "if," taking the form 𐬯𐬉 *sê* (more correctly, perhaps, 𐬴𐬉 *shê*); for instance, at p. 37 of Olshausen: while on the same page we find 𐬫𐬉𐬰𐬌𐬗𐬀 𐬵𐬉 *yêzicha hê*, (*und wenn ihm,*) [G. Ed. p. 53.] "and if to him." In the following page we find a similar phenomenon, if, as I can hardly doubt, 𐬴𐬃 *shâo* (thus I read it with the variation), corresponds to the Sanskrit असौ *asâu* ("*ille*," "*illa*"): 𐬥𐬋𐬌𐬝 𐬰𐬌 𐬍𐬨 𐬰𐬃 𐬴𐬃 𐬫𐬁 𐬛𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬖𐬀 𐬀𐬐𐬀𐬭𐬱𐬙𐬀, *Nôit zi îm zâo shâo yâ daregha akarsta* (text, 𐬫𐬃 *yâo*) *darĕgha akarsta* (text, 𐬀𐬛𐬀𐬭𐬱𐬙𐬀 *adarsta*), "For not this earth which lies long unploughed."

56ᵃ). An 𐬵 *h* standing between *a* or *â* and a following vowel is usually preceded by a guttural nasal (𐬢 *n̦*); and this appendage seems indispensable—I remember, at least, no exception—in cases where the following vowel is *a*, *â*, or *ĕ*. We find, for instance, 𐬎𐬯𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 *usazayan̦ha*, "thou wast born"; while in the active the personal ending 𐬵𐬌 *hi* of the present admits no nasal; and we find, for instance, 𐬀𐬵𐬌 *ahi*, "thou art," 𐬠𐬀𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬵𐬌 *bacsàhi*, "thou givest," not 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬌 *aṇhi*, 𐬠𐬀𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬌 *bacsaṇhi*.

56*b*). The termination *as*, which in Sanskṛit only before sonant consonants (§. 25.) and अ *a*, dissolves its स् into उ *u*, and contracts the latter together with the preceding *a* into ओ *ó* (compare the French *au*, from *al*): this ancient termination *as* appears in Zend, as also in Prâkṛit and Pali, always under the shape of *ó*. On the other hand, the termination *âs*, which in Sanskṛit before all sonant letters entirely abandons the *s*, in Zend has never allowed the concluding sibilant entirely to expire, but everywhere preserves its fusion in the shape of 𐬋 *o* (for [G. Ed. p. 54.] *u*); and I consider myself thereby strongly supported in a conjecture I enounced before my acquaintance with Zend,* that in Sanskṛit the suppression of a terminating *s* after *â* had preceded the vocalization of this *s* into *u*. It is remarkable that where, in Zend, as above observed, an 𐬢 *ṇ* precedes the 𐬵 *h* which springs out of the *s* of the syllable *âs*, or where, before the enclitic particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, the *s* above mentioned is changed into 𐬱 *ś*, together with these substantial representatives of the *s*, its evaporation into 𐬋 *o* is also retained, and the sibilant thus appears in a double form, albeit torpid and evanescent. To illustrate this by some examples, the Sanskṛit मास् *mâs*, "*luna*"—an uninflected nominative, for the *s* belongs to the root—receives in Zend the form 𐬨𐬃 *mâo*, in which *o* represents the Sanskṛit *s*; माश्च *mâś-cha*, "*lunaque*," gives us 𐬨𐬃𐬱𐬗𐬀 *mâoścha*, and मासम् *mâsam*, "*lunam*," 𐬨𐬃𐬢𐬵𐬆𐬨 *mâoṇhĕm*; so that in the two last examples the Sanskṛit sibilant is represented by a vowel and a consonant. The analogy of *mâoṇhĕm*, "*lunam*," is followed in all similar instances; for example, for आस *âsa* "*fuit*," we find 𐬃𐬢𐬵𐬀 *âoṇha*, and for आसाम् *âsâm*, "*earum*," 𐬃𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬄𐬨 *âoṇhaṅm*†.

---

* Observations, rule 78 of the Latin edition of Sanskṛit Grammar.

† Burnouf is of a different opinion as to the matter in question, for in the

57. Two sibilants remain to be mentioned, namely, 𐬰 and 𐬲, of which the former was probably pronounced like the French *z*, and may therefore be replaced [G. Ed. p. 55.] by that letter. Etymologically this letter answers to the Sanskrit ह् *h* for the most part, which never corresponds to the Zend 𐬵 *h*. Compare, for example,

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.
अहम् *aham*, "I,"	𐬀𐬰𐬆𐬨 *azĕm*.
हस्त *hasta*, "hand,"	𐬰𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀 *zaśta*.
सहस्र *sahasra*, "thousand,"	𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬢𐬭𐬀 *hazaṇra*.
हन्ति *hanti*, "he strikes,"	𐬰𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬙𐬌 *zainti*.
वहति *vahati*, "he carries," "bears,"	𐬬𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *vazaiti*.
हि *hi*, "for,"	𐬰𐬌 *zi*.
जिह्वा *jihwâ*, "tongue,"	𐬵𐬌𐬰𐬎𐬀 *hizva*, (§. 53.)
महत् *mahat*, "great,"	𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬋 *mazô* (from *mazas*, acc. 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬆𐬨 *mazaṇhĕm*.)

58. Sometimes 𐬰 *z* appears also in the place of the Sanskrit ज् *j;* so that the sibilant portion of this letter, pronounced *dsch*, is alone represented, and the *d* sound suppressed (see §. 53.). Thus 𐬫𐬀𐬰 *yaz*, "to adore," answers to the Sanskrit यज् *yaj*; 𐬰𐬀𐬋𐬱𐬀 *zaôsha*, "to please," springs from the Sanskrit root जुष् *jush*, "to please *or* gratify." Thirdly, the Zend *z* represents also the Sanskrit ग् *g*, which is easily accounted for by the relationship between *g* and *j*. The Indian *gô*, (accus. *gâm*,) *bos* and *terra*, has, in Zend, as also in Greek, clothed itself in two forms; the first

---

the Nouveau Journ. Asiatique, tom. iii. p. 342, speaking of the relation of *mâoṇho* to *mananhô*, without noticing the analogies which occur in cases of repetition, *mâosh-cha*, "*lunaque*," *urvâraosh-cha*, "*arboresque*," he says, "In *mâonghô*, there is perhaps this difference, that the *ngh* does not replace the Sanskrit *s*, for this letter has already become *o* in consequence of a change of frequent occurrence which we have lately noticed.

signification has maintained itself in Zend, but in Greek has given way to the labial; and *βοῦς* and 𐬔𐬃𐬊𐬯 *gâos*, or 𐬔𐬃𐬎𐬯 *gâus*, correspond to the Sanskrit nom. गौस् *gâus*. [G. Ed. p. 56.] For the signification "earth" the Greek has preserved the guttural, which in Zend is replaced by *z*. The nom. 𐬰𐬃𐬊 *zâo* supposes an Indian form गास् *gâs*, for गौस् *gâus*; in the accusative, 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬨 *zaṅm* agrees, in respect of inflection, as closely as possible with गाम् *gâm* and *γῆν*.

59. 𐬲 is of less frequent use, and was probably pronounced like the French *j*: we write it *zh*. It is observable, that as the French *j* in many words corresponds to the Latin semi-vowel *j*, and derives from it its own developement, so also sometimes, in Zend, 𐬲 *zh* has arisen out of the Sanskrit य् *y*. Thus, for instance, यूयम् *yûyam*, "you," (*vos*), becomes 𐬫𐬏𐬲𐬆𐬨 *yûzhĕm*. Sometimes, also, 𐬲 *zh* has sprung from the sound of the English *j*, and corresponds to the Sanskrit ज् *j*, as in 𐬲𐬆𐬥𐬎 *zhĕnu*, Sanskrit जानु *jânu*, "knee." Finally, it stands as a terminating letter in some prefixes, in the place of the Sanskrit dental स् *s* after *i* and *u*; thus, 𐬥𐬌𐬲𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *nizhbaraiti*, "he carries out"; 𐬛𐬎𐬲𐬏𐬑𐬙𐬆𐬨 *duzh-ûctĕm*, "ill spoken": on the other hand, 𐬛𐬎𐬯𐬨𐬀𐬙𐬆𐬨 *dus-matĕm*, "ill thought."

60. We have still to elucidate the nasals, which we have postponed till now, because for them a knowledge of the system of the other sounds is indispensable. We must first of all mention a difference from the Sanskrit, that in Zend every organ has not its particular nasal; but that here, in respect of *n*, two main distinctions are established, and that these mainly depend on the circumstance whether *n* precedes a vowel or a consonant. In this manner 𐬥 and 𐬧 are so contrasted, that the first finds its place chiefly before whole and half vowels, and also at the end of words; the latter only [G. Ed. p. 57.] in the middle of strong consonants. We find, for instance, 𐬵𐬀𐬧𐬐𐬃𐬭𐬀𐬫𐬈𐬨𐬌 *hankârayêmi*, "I glorify"; 𐬞𐬀𐬧𐬗𐬀 *pancha*, "five"; 𐬠𐬏𐬱𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬆𐬨 *bûshyantĕm*: on the

other hand, 𐬥𐬁 *nâ* (nom.) "man"; 𐬥𐬋𐬌𐬝 *nôiṭ*, "not"; 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬫𐬆𐬥 *barayĕn*, "they might bear"; 𐬀𐬥𐬫𐬀 *anya*, "the other." Concerning the difference between 𐬥 and 𐬧—a difference not recognised in European alphabets—it is probable that 𐬧, being always fenced in by strong consonants, must have had a duller and more suppressed sound than the freer 𐬥; and by reason of this weak and undecided character of its pronunciation, would appear to have applied itself more easily to every organ of the following letter.

61. Still feebler and more undecided than 𐬧, perhaps an equivalent to the Indian Anuswâra, we conjecture to have been the nasal 𐬄, which is always involved with 𐬀 *a*, and which seems from its form to have been a fusion of 𐬀 and 𐬥. We find this letter, which we write *an̉*, first, before sibilants, before 𐬵 *h*, like the Anuswâra, and before the aspirates 𐬚 *th* and 𐬟 *f*; for instance, 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬄𐬯 *csayan̉s*, "*regnans*," accus. 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬆𐬨 *csayantĕm*; 𐬰𐬄𐬵𐬫𐬀𐬨𐬁𐬥𐬀 *zan̉hyamâna*, a part of the middle future of the root 𐬰𐬀𐬥 *zan*, "to beget," but, as it seems to me, with a passive signification ("*qui nascetur*," Vend. S. pp. 28 and 103.); 𐬨𐬄𐬚𐬭𐬀 *man̉thra*, "speech," from the root 𐬨𐬀𐬥 *man*; 𐬘𐬄𐬟𐬥𐬎 *jan̉fnu*, "mouth," probably from the Sanskrit जप् *jap*, "to pray," §. 40., and with the nasal inserted. Secondly, before a terminating 𐬨 *m* and 𐬥 *n*. We have here to observe that the Sanskrit termination आम् *âm* is always changed to 𐬄𐬨 *an̉m* in Zend; for intance, 𐬛𐬀𐬜𐬄𐬨 *dadhan̉m*, "I gave," Sanskrit अददाम् *adadâm*; 𐬞𐬁𐬜𐬀𐬥𐬄𐬨 *pâdhanan̉m*, "*pedum*," Sans. पादानाम् *pâdânâm*; and that the ter- [G. Ed. p. 58.] mination of the third person plural, अन् *an*, provided the *a* do not pass into *ĕ*, always appears as a double nasal 𐬄𐬥 *an̉n*.*

62. For the nasal, which, according to §. 56., is placed as an euphonic addition before the 𐬵 *h*, which springs from स् *s*, the Zend has two characters, 𐬢 and 𐬣, to both which

---

* The termination *an̉n* from *ân* belongs to the potential, precative, and subjunctive.

Anquetil assigns the sound *ng*.* We write them *ṇ*, in order to avoid giving the appearance of a *g* preceded by a guttural *n* to this guttural, which is only a nasal precursor of the following 𐬵 *h*. As to the difference in the use of these two letters, 𐬢 always follows *a* and *âo*; 𐬣, on the contrary, comes after *i* and *e*, for which the occasion is rare. For instance, in the relative plural nom. 𐬫𐬉𐬣𐬵𐬉 *yêṇhê*, "*qui*," and in the fem. pron. genitives, as 𐬀𐬌𐬣𐬵𐬃 *aiṇhâo*, "*hujus*," which often occurs, but as often without 𐬌 *i*, and with 𐬢 *ṇ*, 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬃 *aṇhâo*. What phonetic difference existed between 𐬢 and 𐬣 we cannot venture to pronounce. Anquetil as we have seen, assigns the same pronunciation to each; while Rask compares 𐬣 with the Sanskrit palatal ञ् *n*, and illustrates its sound by that of the Spanish and Portuguese ñ.

63. The labial nasal 𐬨 *m* does not differ from the Sanskrit म्: it must, however, be remarked, that it sometimes takes the place of *b*. At least the root ब्रू *brû*, "speak," in Zend becomes 𐬨𐬭𐬏 *mrû*; as 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬨 *mraôm*, "I spoke," 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬝 *mraôṭ*, "he spoke": in a similar manner is the Indian मुख *mukha*, "mouth," related to the Latin *bucca*; and not [G. Ed. p. 59.] much otherwise the Latin *mare* to the Sanskrit वारि *vâri*, "water." I consider, also, *multus* related to बहुल *bahula*, the Greek πολύς, and the Gothic *filu*.

64. A concluding 𐬨 *m* operates in a double manner on a preceding vowel. It weakens (see §. 30.) the 𐬀 *a* to 𐬆 *ĕ*; and, on the other hand, lengthens the vowels *i* and *u*; thus, for instance, 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬍𐬨 *paitîm*, "the Lord," 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬏𐬨 *tanûm*, "the body," from the bases 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *paiti*, 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎 *tanu*. In contradiction to this rule we find the vocative of frequent occurrence, 𐬀𐬱𐬁𐬎𐬨 *ashâum*, "pure." Here, however, 𐬁𐬎 *âu*, as a diphthong, answers to the Sanskrit औ *âu*, the last element of which is not capable of further lengthening

---

* Burnouf also writes the first of these *ng*. I have done the same in my reviews in the Journal of Lit. Crit.

The form in question is a contraction of the theme 𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬥 *ashavan;* with an irregular conversion of the concluding 𐬥 *n* into 𐬨 *m*.

65. We give here a complete summary of the Zend characters.

Simple Vowels: 𐬀 *a*, 𐬆 *ĕ*, 𐬇 *e;* 𐬁 *â;* 𐬌 *i*, 𐬍 *î;* 𐬎 *u*, 𐬊 *o*, 𐬏 *û*,

Diphthongs: 𐬉, 𐬈 *ê*, 𐬋𐬌 *ôi;* 𐬁𐬌 *âi;* 𐬋 *ô*, 𐬃 *âo*, 𐬁𐬎 *âu*.

Gutturals: 𐬐 *k* (before vowels and 𐬎𐬎 *v*), 𐬑 *c* (principally before consonants), 𐬓 *kh* (from स्व *sw*, before vowels and 𐬌𐬌 *y*); 𐬔 *g*, 𐬖 *gh*.

Palatals: 𐬗 *ch*, 𐬘 *j*.

Dentals: 𐬙 *t* (before vowels and 𐬌𐬌 *y*), 𐬝 *ṭ* (before consonants and at the end of words), 𐬚 *th* (before whole and semi-vowels), 𐬛 *d*, 𐬜 *dh*.

Labials: 𐬞 *p*, 𐬟 *f* (the latter before vowels, semi-vowels, nasals, and 𐬯 *s*), 𐬠 *b*.

Semi-vowels: 𐬫, 𐬪, 𐬌𐬌 *y* (the two first initial, the last medial), 𐬭, 𐬭 *r* (the last only after 𐬟 *f*), 𐬬, 𐬎𐬎 *v* (the first initial, the last medial), 𐬡 *w*. [G. Ed. p. 60.]

Sibilants and *h*: 𐬳 *ś*, 𐬱 *sh*, 𐬯 *s*, 𐬲 *zh* (or like the French *j*), 𐬰 *z*, 𐬵 *h*.

Nasals: 𐬥 *n* (before vowels, semi-vowels, and at the end of words), 𐬧 *n* (before strong consonants), 𐬄 *aṇ* (before sibilants, 𐬵 *h*, 𐬚 *th*, 𐬟 *f*, 𐬨 *m*, and 𐬥 *n*), 𐬢 *ṇ* (between 𐬀 *a* or 𐬃 *âo*, and 𐬵 *h*, and between *a* and *r**), 𐬣 *ṇ* (between 𐬌 *i* or 𐬈 *ê*, and 𐬵 *h*), 𐬨 *m*.

Remark also the Compounds 𐬀𐬵 for 𐬀𐬵 *ah*, and 𐬯𐬙 for 𐬯𐬙 *st*.

66. We refrain from treating specially of the Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian systems of sounds, but must here devote a closer consideration to the Germanic. The Gothic *a*, which, according to Grimm, is always short, answers

---

* E.g. 𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬢𐬭𐬀 *hazaṇra*, "a thousand."

completely to the Sanskṛit *a*; and the sounds of the Greek *ε* and *ο* are wanting, in their character of degeneration from *a*, in Gothic as well as in Sanskṛit. The ancient *a* has not, however, always been retained in Gothic; but in radical syllables, as well as in terminations, has often been weakened to *i*, or has undergone suppression; often, also, by the influence of a following liquid, has been converted into *u*. Compare, for instance, *sibun*, "seven," with सप्तन् *saptan*; *taihun*, "ten," with दशन् *daśan*.

67. We believe ourselves authorized to lay down as a law, that अ *a* in polysyllabic words before a terminating *s* is everywhere weakened into *i*, or suppressed; but before a terminating *th* generally appears as *i*. A concluding अ *a* in the Gothic either remains unaltered, or disappears: it never becomes *i*.

68. In the Old High German the Gothic *a* either remains [G. Ed. p. 61.] unaltered, or is weakened to *e*, or is changed by the influence of a liquid to *u* = perhaps *o*. According to this, the relation of the unorganic *e* to the Gothic *a* is the same as that of the Gothic *i* (§. 66.) to अ *a*; compare, for instance, in the genitive of the bases in *a* वृकस्य *vṛika-sya*, Gothic *vulfi-s*, Old High German *wolfe-s*. In the dative plural *wolfu-m* stands to *vulfa-m* in the same relation as above (§. 66.), *sibun* to *saptan*. The precedence of a liquid has also, in Old High German, sometimes converted this *a* into *u* or *o*; compare *plinte-mu*(*mo*), *cœco*, with the Gothic *blindamma*. Also after the German *j* or *y*, which in Sanskṛit (य् *y*) belongs as a semi-vowel to the same class as *r*, the Old High German seems to prefer *u* to *a*; thence *plintju*, without *j* also *plintu*, "*cæca*," as a fem. nom. sing., and neuter nom. acc. voc. plural; *plinta* "*cæcam*." The *u* of the first person present, as *kipu*, "I give," Gothic *giba*, I ascribe to the influence of the dropped personal letter *m*. Respecting the degeneration of the original *a* sound to *u* compare also §. 66. In the Old High German inseparable preposition *ki* (our German *ge*) = Gothic *ga*, Sanskṛit स *sa* or सम् *sam*, we

have an example in which the Gothic-Sanskṛit *a* has become *i*.

69, For the Sanskṛit आ *â*, the Gothic, which has no long *a*, almost always substitutes *ô* (§. 4.), and this *ô*, in cases of abbreviation, falls back into the short *a*. Thus, for instance, in Grimm's first fem. declension of the strong form, the nom. and accus. sing. *ô* is softened to *a*, whence *giba*, *gibô-s* (§. 118.). Generally in the Gothic polysyllabic forms, the concluding आ *â* is shortened to *a*; and where *ô* stands at the termination, an originally succeeding consonant has been dropped; for instance, in the gen. plur. fem. *ô* stands for आम् *âm*. Sometimes, also, in the Gothic, *ê* corresponds to the Sanskṛit *â*, as in the gen. plur. masc. and neuter. In the Old High German the Gothic *ô* either [G. Ed. p. 62.] remains *ô*, as in the gen. plur., or divides itself into two short vowels; and, according to differences of origin, into *oa*, *ua*, or *uo*; of which, in the Middle High German, *uo* prevails; while in the Modern High German the two divided vowels are contracted into *û*. For the Gothic *ê* = आ *â*, the Old, Middle, and Modern High German have preserved the old *â*, except in the gen. plural.

70. For इ *i* and ई *î* the Gothic has *i* and *ei*; which latter, as Grimm has sufficiently shewn, is everywhere to be considered as long *i*, and also in Old and Middle High German is so represented. We, together with Grimm, as in the case of the other vowels, designate its prolongation by a circumflex. In the Modern High German the long *i* appears mostly as *ei*; compare, for instance, *mein* with the Gothic genitive *meina*, and the Old and Middle High German *mîn*. Sometimes a short *i* is substituted, as in *lich*, answering to the Gothic *leiks*, "like," at the end of compounds. On the long *i*, in *wîr*, "*nos*," Gothic *veis*, we can lay no stress, as we match the dat. sing. *mîr* also with the Gothic *mis*. It is scarcely worth remarking that we usually, in writing, designate the elongation of the *i* and other vowels by the addition of an *h*.

71. While the original अ *a* has undergone many alterations in the Germanic languages, and has produced both *i* and *u*, I have been able to detect no other alterations in *i* and *î* than that *i* is as often suppressed as *a*; but it never happens, unless some rare exceptions have escaped me, that *i* is replaced by a heavier vowel *a* or *u*.* We may lay [G. Ed. p. 63.] it down as a rule, that final *i* has given way in German everywhere, as it has generally in Latin. Compare.

SANSKṚIT.	GREEK.	LATIN.	GOTHIC.
परि *pari*,	περί,	*per*,	*fair*. (§. 82.)
उपरि *upari*,	ὑπέρ,	*super*,	*ufar*.
अस्ति *asti*,	ἐστί,	*est*,	*ist*.
सन्ति *santi*,	ἐντί,	*sunt*,	*sind*.

72. Where a concluding *i* occurs in Gothic and Old High German it is always a mutilation of the German *j* (or *y*) together with the following vowel; so that *j*, after the suppression of this vowel, has vocalized itself. Thus the uninflected Gothic accus. *hari*, "*exercitum*," is a mutilation of *harỵa*.† The Sanskṛit would require *harya-m;* and the Zend, after §. 42., meeting the Germanic half way, *harî-m*. Before a concluding *s* also, in the Gothic, इ *i* is usually suppressed; and the Gothic terminating syllable *is*, is mostly a weakening of *as*, §. 67. In Old High German, and still more in Middle and Modern High German, the Gothic *i* has often degenerated into *e*, which, where it occurs in the accented syllable, is expressed in Grimm by *ë*. We retain this character. We have also to observe of the Gothic, that, in the old text, *i*

---

* The Sanskṛit पितृ *pitṛi*, "father," probably stands for पातृ *pâtṛi*, "ruler"; and the European languages have adhered to the true original. (Gramm. Crit. r. 178, Annot.)

† In the text *harja;* but in order to shew more exactly the connection with the Sanscrit य *y*, vide §. 68. l. 12.; and as the *j* is simply and universally pronounced *y*, the German *j* will be represented by *ỵ* in this translation.

at the beginning of a syllable is distinguished by two dots above, which Grimm retains.

73. As in Zend (§. 41.), by the attractive force of *i*, *î*, or *y*, an *i* is introduced into the antecedent syllable; so also, in Old High German, the corresponding sounds have obtained an assimilating power; and frequently an [G. Ed. p. 64.] *a* of the preceding syllable is converted into *e*, without any power of prevention on the part of either a single or double consonant. Thus, for instance, we find from *ast*, "branch," the plural *esti*; from *anst*, "grace," the plural *ensti*; and from *vallu*, "I fall," the second and third persons *vellis*, *vellit*. This law, however, has not prevaded the Old High German universally: we find, for instance, *arpi*, "*hereditas*," not *erpi*; *zahari*, "*lacrymæ*," not *zaheri*.

74. In the Middle High German, the *e*, which springs from the older *i*, has both retained and extended the power of modification and assimilation; inasmuch as, with few limitations, (Grimm, p. 332,) not only every *a* by its retrospective action becomes *e*, but generally, also, *â*, *u*, and *o* are modified into *æ*, *ü*, and *ö*; *ô* into *œ*, and *uo* into *ue*. Thus the plural *geste*, *dræte*, *brüche*, *köche*, *læne*, *gruese*, from *gast*, *drât*, *bruch*, *koch*, *lôn*, *gruoz*. On the other hand, in the Old High German, the *e* which has degenerated from *i* or *a* obtains no such power; and we find in the genitive singular of the above words, *gaste-s*, *drate-s*, &c., because the Old High German has already, in the declension of the masculine *i* class, reduced to *e* the *i* belonging to the class, and which in Gothic remains unaltered.

75. The *e* produced in Old and Middle High German by the modification of *a*, is retained in the Modern High German, in cases where the trace of the original vowel is either extinguished or scarcely felt; as, *Ende*, *Engel*, *setzen*, *netzen*, *nennen*, *brennen*; Goth. *andi*, *aggilus*, *satỵan*, *natỵan*, *namnỵan*, *brannỵan*. Where, however, the original vowel is distinctly opposed to the change, we place *ä*, short or

[G. Ed. p. 65.] long, from short or long *a*; and in the same relation, *ü* from *u*, *ö* from *o*, *äu* from *au*; for instance, *Brände, Pfäle, Dünste, Flüge, Köche, Töne, Bäume*, from *Brand, Pfâl*, &c.

76. For उ *u*, ऊ *û*, the Gothic has *u*, which is generally short. Among the few examples cited by Grimm, p. 41, of long *u*, we particularize the comparative *sûtizô*, the essential part of which corresponds to the Sansk. स्वादु *swâdu*, "sweet," (ἡδύ-ς), and in which the long *u* may stand as a compensation for the absence of the *w*(*v*), which becomes vocalized. In Old High German it seems to me that *pûam*, "to dwell," and *trûên*, "to trust," correspond to the Sanskrit roots भू *bhû*, "to be," ध्रु *dhrû* "to stand fast"—from which comes ध्रुव *dhruva*, "fast," "constant," "certain" (Gramm. Crit. r. 51.)—with the Guna form of which (§. 26.) the Goth. *bauan, trauan*, is connected; cf. भवितुम् *bhav-itum*, "to be," ध्रवितुम् *dhrav-itum*, "to stand fast." The Middle High German continues the Gothic Old High German *û*, but the Modern High German substitutes *au*, whence *bauen, trauen, Taube* (Gothic *dûbô*).

77. As out of the Sanskrit उ *u*, in Zend, the sound of a short 𐬊* has developed itself (§. 32.), thus, also, the Gothic *u* shews itself, in the more recent dialects, oftener in the form of *o* than in its own. Thus have the Verbs in the Old and Middle High German (Grimm's 9th conjug.) preserved a radical *u* in the plur. of the pret., but replaced it by *o* in the passive part. Compare, for instance, *bugum*, "we bend," *bugans*, "bent," with Old High German *pukumês, pokanêr*, Middle High German *bugen, bogen*. The example adduced shews, also, the softening of the old *u* to *e*, in unaccented syllabes, in Middle High German as in Modern High German; so that this unaccented *e* may represent all original vowels—*a, i, u*; and we may lay it down as a rule, that all long and short vowels in the last syllable of poly-

---

* Cf. §. 447. Note.

syllabic words, are either worn away or softened down to a mute *e*.

78. For the diphthongs ए *ê* (*a*+*i*) and [G. Ed. p. 66.] ओ *ô* (*a* + *u*), the Gothic has *ai* and *au*, which are also monosyllabic, and were perhaps pronounced like ए *ê* and *ô*. Compare *bavaima*, "*ædificemus*" with भवेम *bhavêma*, "*simus*"; *sunau-s*, "of a son," with its equivalent सुनोस् *sunô-s*. Where these Gothic diphthongs *ai* and *au* have maintained themselves unaltered in value, they then appear, in writing, as *ê* and *ô*,* which must be considered as contractions of *a* + *i* and *a* + *u*; as in the Latin *amêmus*, from *amaïmus* (§. 5.); and as in the almost solitary case of *bôs*, the long *o* of which is the result of a contraction of *a* + *u*, whose latter element appears again before vowels in the independent shape of *v* (*bovis*, *bovem*), while the first element *ă*, in its degeneration, appears as *ŏ* (§. 3.). Compare,

SANSKRIT.	GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERMAN.
चरेम *charêma* (*eamus*),	*faraima*,	*varêmês*.
चरेत *charêta* (*eatis*),	*faraith*,	*varêt*.
तेभ्यस *têbhyas* (*his*),	*thaim*	*dêm*.

79. In like manner, in all subjunctives, and in the pronominal declension in which the adjective bases in *a* take part, an Old High German *ê* corresponds to the Sanskrit ए *ê* and Gothic *ai*. The Middle High [G. Ed. p. 67.] German has shortened this *ê*, as standing in an unaccented terminating syllable (*varen*, *varet*). Besides this, the Middle High German has, in common with the Old High German,

---

If, however, the Gothic diphthongs in question were not pronounced like their etymological equivalents ए *ê* and ओ *ô*, but, as Grimm conceives, approximate to the Vṛiddhi-change (§. 26.) ऐ *ai* and औ *âu*: in such case the High German *ê*, *ô*, as opposed to the Gothic *ai*, *au*, are not merely continuations of these Gothic diphthongs: but the pronunciation assigned by the Sanskṛit to the union of *a* with *i* or *u*, must have been first introduced into the Germanic, under certain conditions, in the eighth century.

preserved the diphthong *ê* where it stood in radical syllables under the protection of a following *u*, *r* (out of the older *s*), or *h* (*ch*), even in cases where one of these letters had been dropped, or where *u* had vocalized itself into *v* or *o*. (Grimm. pp. 90. 343). Compare,

GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERMAN.	MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN.
aiv, "*ævum*,"	*êwîn*.	
snaivs, "*nix*,"	*snêo*,	*snê*.
mais, "*magis*,"	*mêr*,	*mê*.
laisyan, "*docere*,"	*lêran*,	*lêren*.
laihv, "*commodavit*,"	*lêh*	*lêch*.

In the Modern High German this *ê* is partly preserved, partly replaced; for instance, *mêr* (*mehr*), *Schnê* (*Schnee*), *Sêle* (Gothic *saivala*); but *ich lieh*, *gedieh*. (Grimm. p. 983.).

80. As the *ê* for the Gothic *ai*, so the *ô* for *aù*, in the Old and Middle High German, is favoured by certain consonants; and those which favour the *ô* are the more numerous. They consist of the dentals (according to the Sanskrit division, §. 16.) *t*, *d*, *z*, together with their nasal and sibilant (*n*, *s*); further, the semi-vowel *r*; and *h*, which, as a termination in Middle High German, becomes *ch* (See Grimm, pp. 94. 345). The roots, which in the Gothic admit the Guna modification of the radical *u* by *a*, in the preterite singular, oppose to the Gothic *au*, in Middle and Old High German, a double form; namely, *ô* under the condition above mentioned, and next *ou*, §. 34., in the absence [G. Ed. p. 68.] of the letter which protects *ô*. For instance, Old High German *zôh*, Middle High German *zôch* (*traxi*, *traxit*) Gothic *tauh*, Sanskrit दुदोह *dudôha* (*mulxi*, *mulsi*,); but *pouc*, *bouc*, *flexi*, *flexit*, Gothic *baug*, Sanskrit बुभोज *bu-bhôja*. The Modern High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong *au*, either, like the Middle and Old High German, as *ô*, and in a more extended degree, and subject to the modification of §. 75; or next, shortened to *o*,

the particulars of which will be explained under the verb; or, thirdly, as *au*; for instance, *daupya*, " I baptize," *hlaupa*, " I run"; or, fourthly, as *eu*, §. 83.

81. As Ulfilas, in proper names, represents both *ε* and *αι* by *ai*, and likewise *o* and *αυ* by *au* (*Paitrus*, *Galeilaia*, *apaustaulus*, *Paulus*); and as, in the next place, not every Gothic *ai* and *au* in the cognate dialects is represented in like manner, but in some cases the Gothic *ai* is replaced in Old High German by a simple *i* or *ë*, and *au* by *u* or *o* (§. 77.); but in the others, *ai* is replaced by *ê*, or (§. 85.) by *ei*, and *au* by *ô* or (§. 84.) *ou*; therefore Grimm deduces from these facts a double value of the diphthongs *ai* and *au*; one with the accent on the last element (*aí*, *aú*), another with the accent on the *a* (*ái*, *áu*). We cannot, however, give implicit belief to this deduction of the acute author of the German system of sounds, and prefer assuming an equal value in all cases of the Gothic *ai* and *au*, although we might support Grimm's view by the fact, that, in Sanskṛit, ए *ê*, ओ *ô*, never replace his *aí* and *aú*; but everywhere, where occasion occurs, do replace *ái* and *áu*. We think, however, that the difference is rather phonetic than etymological. As concerns the *ai* and *au* in proper names, it may be accounted for, inasmuch as the Gothic was [G. Ed. p. 69.] deficient in equivalents for these non-primitive vowels, which have degenerated from the original अ *a*. Could Ulfilas have looked back into the early ages of his language, and have recognised the original idenity of *ε* and *o* with his *a*, he would perhaps have used the latter as their substitutes. From his point of sight, however, he embraced the *ai* and *au*, probably because these mixed diphthongs passed with him as weaker than the long *ê* and *ô*, *ejusdem generis*, = (आ *â*). It is important here to observe, that in Greek also *αι* is felt as weaker than *η* and *ω*, as is proved by the fact that *αι* does not attract the accent towards itself (*τύπτομαι* not *τυπτόμαι*. The expression of the Greek *αι* and *αυ* by

the Gothic *ai* and *au* requires the less justification, because even if *ai* was pronounced like इ *ê*, and *au* like ओ *ô*, yet the written character presents these diphthongs as a still perceptible fusion of *a* with a following *i* or *u*.

82. As to the other statement, namely, that not every Gothic *ai* and *au* produces the same effect in the younger dialects, nor has the same foundation in the older Sanskṛit, it might be sufficient to observe upon one feature of dialect peculiar to the Gothic, that *h* and *r* do not content themselves with a pure preceding *i*, but require it to be affected by Guna (§. 26.); thus, *ai* for *i*, and *au* for *u*; while other dialects exhibit the *i* and *u* before *h* and *r* in the same form as before every other consonant. The relation of the Gothic to their Sanskṛit equivalents,

GOTHIC	SANSKṚIT.
saihs, "six,"	षष् *ṣhaṣh*,
taihun, "ten,"	दशन् *daśan*,
faihu, "cattle,"	पशु *paśu*,
svaihra "father-in-law,"	श्वशुर *śwaśura*,
taihsvô, "dextera,"	दक्षिणा *dakṣhiṇâ*,
hairtô, "heart,"	हृद् *hṛid* (from *hard* §. 1.),
bairan, "to bear,"	भर्तुम् *bhartum*,
distairan, "to tear,"	दरितुम् *dar-i-tum*,
stairnô, "star,"	तारा *târâ*,

[G. Ed. p. 70.]

is not so to be understood as though an *i* had been placed after the old *a*, but that, by the softening down of the *a* to *i* (§. 66.), the forms *sihs*, *tihun*, had been produced; out of which, afterwards, the Guna power arising from *h* and *r* had produced *saihs*, *taihun*, *bairan*. The High German has, however, remained at the earlier stage; for Old High German *sëhs*, (Anglo-Saxon, "six,") and *tëhan* or *tëhun*, &c., rest upon an earlier Gothic *sihs*, *tihun*. Thus, *tohtar* rests on an earlier Gothic *duhtar*, for the Guna form *dauhtar*, Sanskṛit दुहितर् *duhitar*, (दुहितृ *duhitṛi*, §. 1.) "daughter." Where the

Sanskṛit अ *a* has preserved itself in the Gothic unaltered, that is, not weakened to *i*, the occasion is absent for the development of the diphthong *ai*, since it is not the *a* before *h* and *r* which demands a subsequent addition, but the *i* which demands a precedent one; compare *ahtau*, "eight," with अष्टौ *aṣhṭâu.**

83. The alterations to which the simple vowels have been subjected appear again in the simple elements of the diphthongs, as well in the relation of the Gothic to the Sanskṛit, as in that of the younger Germanic dialects to the Gothic. Thus the *a* element of the diphthong ओ *ô* shews itself often in the Gothic, and in certain places in a regular manner, as *i* (§. 27.); and in the same places the *a* contained in ए *ê* (*a*+*i*) becomes *i*, which, with the second element of the diphthong, generates a long *i* (written as *ei*, §. 70.). The Gothic *iu* has either retained that form in Old High German, or has altered sometimes one, sometimes both of its constituents. Thus have arisen *io*, *ëo*. [G. Ed. p. 71.] There is a greater distance to be passed in Otfrid's theory of the substitution of *ia* for *iu*, which cannot fail to surprise, as we know that a simple *u* never becoms *a*.† In Middle High German *iu* has either remained unaltered, or has been changed to *ie*, which is as old as the latest Old High German, as it is found in Notker. In Modern High German the substitution of *ie* for the old *iu* is that which princi-

---

* *Ahtau*=*aṣhṭâu* is perhaps the only case in which the Gothic *au* corresponds to the Sanskṛit Vṛiddhi diphthong औ *âu*; on the other hand, *au* often answers to ओ *ô*=(*a*+*u*).

† There is yet another *ia* in Old High German, namely, that which Grimm (p. 103) very acutely represents as the result of a contraction, and formerly dissyllabic, to which, therefore, there is no counterpart diphthong in Gothic. The most important case will be discussed under the head of the verb, in preterites, such as *hialt*, "I held," Gothic *haihald*. After this analogy *fiar*, "four," (according to Otfrid), arose out of the Gothic *fidvor*, in this way, that, after the extrusion of the *dv*, the *ô* passed into its corresponding short vowel.—*Grimm*, p. 193.

pally prevails, in which, however, the *e* is only visibly retained, for phonetically it is absorbed by the *i*. Compare *ich biete* with the Gothic *biuda*, *giesse* with *giuta*. Besides this form, we also find *eu* in place of the old *iu* or still older *au*, in cases, namely, where *e* can be accounted for as the result of a no longer perceptible modification (Grimm, p. 523, §. 75.); compare *Leute* with the Gothic *laudeis*, Old High German *liuti*, "people"; *Heu*, "hay," with Goth, *havi*, "grass." Usually, however, the Gothic has already acquired an *iu* in place of this *eu*, and the original *au* (which becomes *av* before vowels) is to be sought in the Sanskṛit; for instance, *Neune*, "nine," Old High German *niuni*, Gothic *niuneis*, Sanskṛit नवन् *navan* (as theme); *neu*, "new," Old High German *niwi* (indeclinable), Gothic *nivi-s*, Sanskṛit नवस् *nava-s*. This *e*, however, is difficult to account for, in as far as it is connected with the *Umlaut*, because it corresponds to an *i* in Middle and Old High German; and this vowel, of itself answering to an *i* or *y* in the following syllable, is capable of no alteration through their power of attraction. Long *u* for *iu*, equivalent to a transposition of the diphthong, is found in *lügen*, "to lie," *trügen*, "to deceive," Middle High German *liugen*, *triugen*.

[G. Ed. p. 72.] 84. Where the *a* element of the Sanskṛit ओ *ó* retains its existence in the Gothic, making *au* the equivalent of *ó*, the Middle High German, and a part of the Old High German authorities, have *ou* in the place of *au*, although, as has been remarked in §. 80, under the influence of certain consonants *ó* prevails. Compare Old High German *pouc*, Middle High German *bouc*, with the Gothic preterite *baug*, "*flexi*." The *o* of the High German *ou* has the same relation to the corresponding Gothic *a* in *au*, as the Greek *o* in βοῦς bears to the Sanskṛit अ *a*, which undergoes a fusion with उ *u* in the ओ *ó* of the cognate word गो *gó*. The oldest Old High German authorities (Gl. Hrab. Ker. Is.) have *au* for the *ou* of the later (Grimm. p. 99); and as under the conditions specified in §. 80., they also exhibit *ô*, this tells in favour of Grimm's assumption, that *au* in the Gothic and oldest High German was pronounced like our German *au*, and thus not like the Sanskrit ओ *ô* (out of *a* + *u*). In this case, in the Gothic *ai*, also, both the letters must have been sounded, and this diphthong must be only an etymological, and not a phonetic equivalent of the Sanskrit ए *ê*.

85. In the Gothic diphthong *ai* the *a* alone is susceptible of alteration, and appears in High German softened down to *e*, in the cases in which the *ê*, contracted from *ai* (§. 78.), does not occur. In Modern High German, however, *ei*, in pronunciation, = *ai*. Compare

GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERMAN.	MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN.	MODERN HIGH GERMAN.
haita, "*voco*,"	*heizu*,	*heize*,	*heisse*.
skaida, "*separo*,"	*skeidu*,	*scheide*,	*scheide*.

86. (1.) Let us now consider the consonants, preserving the Indian arrangement, and thus examining [G. Ed. p. 73.] the gutturals first. Of these, the Gothic has merely the *tenuis* and the medial (*k*, *g*); and Ulfilas, in imitation of the Greek, places the latter as a nasal before gutturals; for instance, *drigkan*, "to drink"; *briggan*, "to bring"; *tuggô*, "tongue"; *yuggs*, "young"; *gaggs*, "a going" (subst.). For the compound *kv* the old writing has a special character, which we, like Grimm, render by *qv*, although *q* does not appear elsewhere, and *v* also combines with *g*; so that *qv* (=*kv*) plainly bears the same relation to *gv* that *k* bears to *g*; compare *sigqvan*, "to sink," with *siggvan*, "to read," "to sing." *H* also, in Gothic, willingly combines with *v*; and for this combination, also, the original text has a special character; compare *saihvan*, *leihvan*, with our *sehen*, *leihen*. In respect to *h* by itself we have to observe that it often appears in relations in which the dentals place their *th* and the labials their *f*, so that in this case it takes the place of

kh, which is wanting in the Gothic. In this manner is *aih* related to *aigum*, "we have," as *bauth* to *budum*, and *gaf* to *gêbum*. Probably the pronunciation of the Gothic *h* was not in all positions the same, but in terminations, and before *t* and *s*, if not generally before consonants, corresponded to our *ch*. The High German has *ch* as an aspirate of the *k*: for this *tenuis*, however, either *k* or *c* stands in the older dialects, the use of which, in Middle High German, is so distinguished, that *c* stands as a terminating letter, and in the middle of words before *t*, and *ch* also stands for a double *k*. (Grimm, p. 422.) This distinction reminds us of the use of the Zend 𐬗 *c* in contrast to 𐬐 *k*, as also of the 𐬝 *ṭ* in contrast to 𐬙 *t*. (§§. 34. 38.)

(2.) The palatals and linguals are wanting in Gothic, as in Greek and Latin; the dentals are, in Gothic, *t*, *th*, *d*, [G. Ed. p. 74.] together with their nasal *n*. For *th* the Gothic alphabet has a special character. In the High German *z* (=*ts*) fills the place of the aspiration of the *t*, so that the breathing is replaced by the sibilation. By the side of this *z* in the Old High German, the old Gothic *th* also maintains its existence.* There are two species of *z*, which, in Middle High German, do not agree with each other. In the one, *t* has the preponderance, in the other, *s*; and this latter is written by Isidor *zs*, and its reduplication *zss*, while the reduplication of the former he writes *tz*. In the Modern High German the second species has only retained the sibilant, but in writing is distinguished, though not universally, from *s* proper. Etymologically, both species of the Old and Middle High German *z* fall under the same head, and correspond to the Gothic *t*.

(3.) The labials are, in Gothic, *p*, *f*, *b*, with their nasal

---

* Our Modern High German *th* is, according to Grimm (p. 525), inorganic, and to be rejected. "It is, neither in pronunciation nor origin, properly aspirated, and nothing but a mere tenuis."

m. The High German supplies this organ, as the Sanskṛit does all, with a double aspiration, a surd (*f* = फ *ph*) (see §. 25.) and a sonant, which is written *v*, and comes nearer to the Sanskṛit भ *bh*. In Modern High German we perceive no longer any phonetic difference between *f* and *v*; but in Middle High German *v* shews itself in this manner softer than *f*, in that, first, at the end of words it is transformed into *f*, on the same principle by which, in such a position, the medials are converted into tenues; for instance, *wolf* not *wolv*, but genitive *wolves*; second, that in the middle before surd consonants it becomes *f*, hence *zwelve* becomes *zwelfte*, *fünve* becomes *funfte, funfzic*. At the beginning of words *f* and *v*, in Middle High German, seem of equal signification, and their use in the MSS. is precarious, [G. Ed. p. 75.] but *v* preponderates (Grimm, pp. 339. 400). It is the same in Old High German; yet Notker uses *f* as the original primarily existing breathing-sound, and *v* as the softer or sonant aspiration, and therefore employs the latter in cases where the preceding word concludes with one of those letters, which otherwise (§. 93.) soften down a tenuis to its medial (Grimm, pp. 135, 136); for instance, *demo vater, den vater*, but not *des vater* but *des fater*. So far the rule is less stringent (observes Grimm), that in all cases *f* may stand for *v*, but the converse does not hold. Many Old High German authorities abandon altogether the initiatory *v*, and write *f* for it constantly, namely, Kero, Otfrid, Tatian. The aspiration of the *p* is sometimes, in Old High German, also rendered by *ph*, but, in general, only at the beginning of words of foreign origin, *phorta, phenning*; in the middle, and at the end occasionally, in true Germanic forms, such as *wërphan, warph, wurphumês*, in Tatian; *limphan* in Otfrid and Tatian. According to Grimm, *ph*, in many cases, has had the mere sound of *f*. "In monumental inscriptions, however, which usually employ *f*, the *ph* of many words had indisputably the sound of *pf*; for example, if Otfrid writes *kuphar*, "*cuprum*," *scepheri*, "Creator," we are not to assume that these words were pronounced *kufar*, *sceferi*" (p. 132). In Middle High German the initial *ph* of foreign words of the Old High German has become *pf* (Grimm, p. 326). In the middle and at the end we find *pf*, first, always after *m*, *kampf*, "*pugna*," *tampf*, "*vapor*," *krempfen*, "*contrahere*," in which case *p* is an euphonic appendage to *f*, in order to facilitate a union with *m*. Secondly, in compounds with the inseparable prefix *ent*, which, before the labial aspirates, lays aside its *t*, or, as seems to me the sounder supposition, converts that letter, by assimilation, into the labial tenuis. Hence, for [G. Ed. p. 76.] instance, *enp-finden*, later and more harmonious *emp-finden*, for *ent-finden*. Standing alone, nevertheless, it appears, in Middle High German, *vinden*, but *v* does not combine with *p*, for after the surd *p* (§. 25.) the surd aspirate is necessary (see Grimm, p. 398). Thirdly, after short vowels the labial aspirates are apt to be preceded by their tenues, as well in the middle as at the end of words: just as in Sanskṛit (Gramm. Crit. r. 88.) the palatal surd aspirate between a short and another vowel or semi-vowel is preceded by its tenuis; and, for instance, पृच्छति *pṛichchhati* is said for पृछति *pṛichhati*. "*interrogat*," from the root प्रछ् *prachh*. In this light I view the Middle High German forms *kopf*, *kropf*, *tropfe*, *klopfen*, *kripfen*, *kapfen* (Grimm, p, 398). In the same words we sometimes find *ff*, as *kaffen*, *schuffen*. Here, also, *p* has assimilated itself to the following *f*; for *f*, even though it be the aspirate of *p*, is not pronounced like the Sanskṛit फ् *ph*, that is, like *p* with a clearly perceptible *h*; but the sounds *p* and *h* are compounded into a third simple sound lying between the two, which is therefore capable of reduplication, as in Greek ϕ unites itself with θ, while *ph* + *th* would be impossible.

(4.) The Sanskrit semi-vowels are represented in Gothic by *j* (=*y*), *r*, *l*, *v*; the same in High German; only in Old High German Manuscripts the sound of the Indo-Gothic *v* (our *w*) is most usually represented by *uu*, in Middle High German by *vv*: *j* (or *ỵ*) in both is written *i*. We agree with Grimm in using *j* (or *ỵ*) and *w* for all periods of the High German. After an initial consonant in Old High German, the semi-vowel *w* in most authorities is expressed by *u*; for instance, *zuelif*, "twelve," Gothic *tvalif*. As in the Sanskṛit and Zend the semi-vowels *y* and *v* often arise out of the corresponding vowels *i* and *u*, so also in the [G. Ed. p. 77.] Germanic; for instance, Gothic *sunìv̀-ê*, "*filiorum*," from the base *sunu*, with *u* affected by Guna (*iu*, §. 27.). More usually, however, in the Germanic, the converse occurs, namely, that *ỵ* and *v*, at terminations and before consonants, have become vocalised (see §. 73.), and have only retained their original form before terminations beginning with a vowel; for if, for instance, *thius*, "servant," forms *thivis* in the genitive, we know, from the history of the word, that this *v* has not sprung from the *u* of the nominative, but that *thius* is a mutilation of *thivas* (§. 116.); so that after the lapse of the *a* the preceding semi-vowel has become a whole one. In like manner is *thivi*, "maid-servant," a mutilation of the base *thivỵô* (§. 120.), whose nominative, like the accusative, probably was *thivỵa*, for which, however, in the accusative, after the *v* had become vocalized, *thiuỵa* was substituted.

(5.) Of the Sanskṛit sibilants, the Germanic has only the last, namely, the pure dental स् *s*. Out of this, however, springs another, peculiar, at least in use, to the Gothic, which is written *z*, and had probably a softer pronunciation than *s*. This *z* is most usually found between two vowels, as an euphonic alteration of *s*, but sometimes also between a vowel and *v*, *l*, or *n*; and between liquids (*l*, *r*, *n*) and a vowel, *ỵ* or *n*, in some words also before *d*; finally, before the guttural medial, in the single instance, *azgô*, "ashes"; everywhere thus before sonants, and it must therefore itself be considered as a sonant sibilant (§. 25.), while *s* is the surd. It is remarkable, in a grammatical point of view, that a concluding *s* before the enclitic particles *ei* and *uh*, and before the passive addition *a*, passes into *z*; hence, for instance, *thizei* "*cujus*," from *this* "*hujus*," *thanzei* "*quos*," from *thans* "*hos*," *vileizuh* "*visne*" from *vileis* "*vis*," *haitaza* "*vocaris*," from *haitis* "*vocas*," or rather from its earlier form [G. Ed. p. 78.] *haitas*. The root *slêp*, "to sleep," forms, by a reduplication, in the preterite, *saizlêp*, "I *or* he slept." Other examples are, *izvis*, "*vobis*," "*vos*," *razn* "house," *talzyan*, "to teach," *marzyan*, "to provoke," *fairzna*, "heel." The High German loves the softening of *s* into *r*, especially between two vowels (see §. 22.); but this change has not established itself as a pervading law, and does not extend over all parts of the Grammar. For instance, in Old High German, the final *s* of several roots has changed itself into *r* before the preterite terminations which commence with a vowel; on the other hand, it has remained unaltered in the uninflected first and third pers. sing. indicative, and also before the vowels of the present. For example, from the root *lus*, comes *liusu*, "I lose," *lôs*, "I *or* he lost," *lurumês* "we lost." While in these cases the termination takes *s* under its protection, yet the *s* of the nominative singular, where it has not been altogether dropped, is everywhere softened down to *r*; and, on the other hand, the concluding *s* of the genitive has, down to our time, remained unaltered, and thus an organic difference has arisen between two cases originally distinguished by a similar suffix. For instance,

	GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERMAN.	MODERN HIGH GERMAN.
Nominative . .	*blind'-s*,	*plintê-r*,	*blinde-r*.
Genitive . . .	*blindi-s*,	*plinte-s*,	*blinde-s*.

87. The Germanic tongues exhibit, in respect of consonants, a remarkable law of displacement, which has been first recognised and developed with great ability by Grimm. According to this law, the Gothic, and the other dialects,

with the exception of the High German, in relation to the Greek, Latin, and, with certain limits, also [G. Ed. p. 79.] to the Sanskṛit and Zend, substitute aspirates for the original tenues, *h* for *k*, *th* for *t*, and *f* for *p*; tenues for medials, *t* for *d*, *p* for *b*, and *k* for *g*; finally, medials for aspirates, *g* for χ, *d* for θ, and *b* for *f*. The High German bears the same regular relation to the Gothic as the latter to the Greek, and substitutes its aspirates for the Gothic tenues and Greek medials; its tenues for the Gothic medials and Greek aspirates; and its medials for the Gothic aspirates and Greek tenues. Yet the Gothic labial and guttural medial exhibits itself unaltered in most of the Old High German authorities, as in the Middle and Modern High German; for instance, Gothic *biuga*, "*flecto*," Old High German *biuga* and *piuka*, Middle High German *biuge*, Modern High German *biege*. For the Gothic *f*, the Old High German substitutes *v*, especially as a first letter (§. 86. 3.). In the *t* sounds, *z* in High German (=*ts*) replaces an aspirate. The Gothic has no aspiration of the *k*, and either replaces the Greek κ by the simple aspiration *h*, in which case it sometimes coincides with the Sanskṛit ह *h*, or it falls to the level of the High German, and, in the middle or end of words, usually gives *g* instead of *k*, the High German adhering, as regards the beginning of words, to the Gothic practice, and participating with that dialect in the use of the *h*. We give here Grimm's table, illustrating the law of these substitutions, p. 584.

Greek	*P*	*B*	*F*	*T*	*D*	*Th*	*K*	*G*	*Ch*
Gothic	*F*	*P*	*B*	*Th*	*T*	*D*		*K*	*G*
Old High German,	*B* (*V*)	*F*	*P*	*D*	*Z*	*T*	*G*	*Ch*	*K*

[G. Ed. p. 80.]

EXAMPLES.*

SANSKRIT.	GREEK.	LATIN.	GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERM.
पादस् *pâda-s,*	*πούς, ποδ-ός,*	*pes, pedis,*	*fôtus,*	*vuoz.*
पञ्चन् *panchan,*	*πέμπε,*	*quinque,*	*fimf,*	*vinf.*
पूर्ण *pûrṇa,*	*πλέος,*	*plenus,*	*fulls,*	*vol.*
पितृ *pitṛi,*	*πατήρ,*	*pater,*	*fadrein*†,	*vatar.*
उपरि *upari,*	*ὑπέρ,*	*super,*	*ufar,*	*ubar.*
	κάνναβις,	*cannabis,*	. .	*hanaf.*
भञ्ज् *bhanj,*	. .	*frangere,*	*brikan,*	*prëchan.*
भुज् *bhuj,*	. .	*frui, fructus,*	*brûkôn,*	*prûchôn.*
भ्रातृ *bhrâtṛi*	. .	*frater,*	*brôthar,*	*pruoder.*
भृ *bhṛi,*	*φέρω,*	*fero,*	*baira,*	*piru.*
भ्रू *bhrû,*	*ὀφρύς,*	. .	. .	*prawa.*
कपाल *kapâla,* m. n.,	*κεφαλή,*	*caput,*	*haubith,*	*houpit.*
त्वम् *twam* (nom.),	*τύ,*	. .	*thu,*	*du.*
तम् *tam* (acc.),	*τόν,*	*is-tum,*	*thana,*	*dën.*
त्रयस् *trayas* (n. pl.),	*τρεῖς,*	*tres,*	*threis,*	*drî.*
अन्तर *antara,*	*ἕτερος,*	*alter,*	*anthar,*	*andar.*
दन्तम् *danta-m* (acc.),	*ὀδόντ-α,*	*dentem,*	*thuntu-s,*	*zand.*
द्वौ *dwau* (n. *du*),	*δύο,*	*duo,*	*tvai,*	*zuênê.*
दक्षिणा *dakṣhiṇâ,*	*δεξία,*	*dextra,*	*taihsvô,*	*zësawa.*
उद *uda,*	*ὕδωρ,*	*unda,*	*vatô,*	*wazar.*
दुहितृ *duhitṛi,*	*ϑυγάτηρ,*	. .	*dauhtar,*	*tohtar.*
द्वार् *dwâr,*	*ϑύρα,*	*fores,*	*daur,*	*tor.*
मधु *madhu,*	*μέθυ,*	. .	. .	*mëto.*
श्वन् *śwan,*	*κύων,*	*canis,*	*hunths,*	*hund.*
हृदय *hṛidaya,*	*καρδία,*	*cor,*	*hairtô,*	*hërza.*
अक्ष *akṣha,*	*ὄκος,*	*oculus,*	*augô,*	*ouga.*
अश्रु *aśru,*	*δάκρυ,*	*lacrima,*	*tagr* m.,	*zahar.*
पशु *paśu,*	. .	*pecus,*	*faihu,*	*vihu.*

[G. Ed. p. 81.]

---

* The Sanskṛit words here stand, where the termination is not separated from the base, or the case not indicated, in their crude or simple form (theme); of the verb, we give only the bare root.

† "Parents."

SANSKRIT.	GREEK.	LATIN.	GOTHIC.	OLD HIGH GERM.
श्वशुर *śwaśura,*	ἑκυρός,	*socer,*	*svaihra,*	*suehur.*
दशन् *daśan,*	δέκα,	*decem,*	*taihun,*	*zëhan.*
ज्ञा *jnâ,*	γνῶμι,	*gnosco,*	*kan,*	*chan.*
जाति *jâti,**	γένος,	*genus,*	*kuni,*	*chuni.*
जानु *jânu,*	γόνυ,	*genu,*	*kniu,*	*chniu.*
महत् *mahat,*	μέγαλος,	*magnus,*	*mikils,*	*mihil.*
हंस *hansa,*	χήν,	*anser,*	*gans,*	*kans.*
ह्यस् *hyas,*	χθές,	*heri,*	*gistra,*	*këstar.*
लिह् *lih,*	λείχω,	*lingo,*	*laigô,*	*lêkôm.*

88. The Lithuanian has left the consonants without displacement in their old situations, only, from its deficiency in aspirates, substituting simple tenues for the Sanskrit aspirated tenues, and medials for the aspirated medials. Compare,

LITHUANIAN.	SANSKRIT.
rata-s, "wheel,"	रथस् *ratha-s,* "waggon."
búsu, "I would be,"	भविष्यामि *bhavishyâmi.*
ka-s, "who,"	कस् *ka-s.*
důmi, "I give,"	ददामि *dadâmi.* [G. Ed. p. 82.]
pats, "husband," "master,"	पतिस् *pati-s.*
penki, "five,"	पञ्चन् *panchan.*
trys, "three,"	त्रयस् *trayas* (n. pl. m.)
keturi, "four,"	चत्वारस् *chatwâras* (n. pl. m.)
ketwirtas, "the fourth,"	चतुर्थस् *chaturtha-s.*
szaká, f. "bough,"	शाखा *śâkhâ.*

Irregular deviations occur, as might be expected, in individual cases. Thus, for instance, *naga-s,* "nail" (of the foot or finger), not *naka-s,* answers to the Sanskrit नखस् *nakhas.* The Zend stands, as we have before remarked, in the same rank, in all essential respects, as the Sanskrit,

---

* From *jan,* "to be born."

Greek, and Latin. As, however, according to §. 47., certain consonants convey an aspiration to the letter which precedes them, this may occasion an accidental coincidence between the Zend and the Gothic; and both languages may, in like manner and in the same words, depart from the original tenuis. Compare,

GOTHIC.	ZEND.	SANSKRIT.
thir (theme), "three,"	𐬚𐬭𐬌 *thri*,	त्रि *tri*.
thus, "to thee,"	𐬚𐬬𐬋𐬌 *thwôi*,	त्वे *twê*.*
fra, (inseparable prep.)	𐬟𐬭𐬀 *fra*,	प्र *pra*
friyô, "I love,"	𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬥𐬁𐬨𐬌 *âfrînâmi*,†	प्रीणामि *prîṇâmi*.
ahva ‡, "a river,"	𐬁𐬟𐬯 *âfs*	अप् *ap* (theme).

[G. Ed. p. 83.] I pronounce this coincidence between the Gothic and the Zend aspirates accidental, because the causes of it are distinct; as, on the one side, the Gothic accords no aspirating influence to the letters *v* and *r* (*truda, trauan, trimpan, tvai*), and, in the examples given above, *th* and *f* stand, only because, according to rule, Gothic aspirates are to be expected in the place of original tenues; on the other side, the Zend everywhere retains the original tenues, where the letters named in §. 47. do not exhibit an influence, which is unknown to the Gothic; so that, quite according to order, in by far the majority of forms which admit of comparison, either Gothic aspirates are met with in the place of Zend tenues, or, according to another appointment of the Germanic law of substitution, Gothic tenues in that of Zend medials. Compare,

---

* *Twê* occurs as an uninflected genitive in Rosen's *Veda-Specimen*, p. 26, and may, like the mutilated ते *tê*, be also used as a dative.

† "I bless," from the Sanskrit root *prî*, "to love," united with the prep. *a*.

‡ *Ahva*. The Sanskrit-Zend expression signifies "water"; and the Gothic form developes itself through the transition, of frequent occurrence, of *p* to *k*, for which the law of substitution requires *h* (see also *aqua*).

GOTHIC.	ZEND.
thu, "thou,"	𐬙𐬏𐬨 *tûm.*
fidvôr, (ind.) "four,"	𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬡𐬁𐬭𐬋 *chathwârô* (n. pl. m.)
fimf,	𐬞𐬀𐬥𐬗𐬀 *pancha.*
fulls, "full,"	𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬋 *pěrěnô* (n. m.)
fadrein, "parents,"	𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬨 *paitar-ěm* (*patrem*).
faths, "master,"	𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬱 *paiti-s.*
faihu, "beast,"	𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎𐬱 *paśu-s.*
faryith, "he wanders,"	𐬗𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *charaiti.*
fôtu-s, "foot,"	𐬞𐬁𐬜𐬀 *pâdha* (§. 39.)
fraihith, "he asks,"	𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬯𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *pěrěśaiti.*
ufar, "over,"	𐬎𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌 *upairi,* (§. 41.)
af, "from,"	𐬀𐬞𐬀 *apa.*
thai, "these,"	𐬙𐬇 *tê.*
hvas, "who,"	𐬐𐬋 *kô.* [G. Ed. p. 84.]
tvai, "two,"	𐬛𐬬𐬀 *dva.*
taihun, "ten,"	𐬛𐬀𐬯𐬀 *daśa.*
taihsvô, "right hand,"	𐬛𐬀𐬱𐬌𐬥𐬀 *dashina,* "*dexter.*"

In the Sanskrit and Zend the sonant aspirates, not the surd, as in Greek, (ह *h* too is sonant, see §. 25.) correspond, according to rule, to the Gothic medials: as, however, in the Zend the *bh* is not found, 𐬠 *b* answers to the Gothic *b*. Compare,

GOTHIC.	ZEND.	SANSKRIT.
bairith, "he carries,"	𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *baraiti,*	बिभर्ति *bibharti.*
brôthar, "brother,"	𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬨 *brâtarěm* (acc.)	भ्रातरम् *bhrâtaram* (acc.)
bai, "both,"	𐬎𐬠𐬀 *uba,*	उभौ *ubhâu* (n. ac. v. du.)
brûkan, "to use,"		भुज् *bhuj,* "to eat."
bi (prep.)	𐬀𐬠𐬌 *abi,* 𐬀𐬌𐬡𐬌 *aiwi,*	अभि *abhi.*
midya, "middling,"	𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬜𐬫𐬀 *maidhya,*	मध्य *madhya.*
bindan, "bind,"	𐬠𐬀𐬥𐬜 *bandh,*	बन्ध् *bandh.*

89. Violations of the law of displacement of sounds, both by persistence in the same original sound, or the substitution of irregular sounds, are frequent in the middle and at the end of

words. Thus, in the Old High German *vatar*, the *t* of the Greek πατήρ remains; in the Gothic *fadrein*, "*parentes*," *d* is substituted irregularly for *th*. The same phenomenon occurs in the cases of the Old High German *olpenta*, and the Gothic *ulbandus*, contrasted with the τ of ἐλεφαντ-; thus, also, the *t* of चतुर् *chatur*, "*quatuor*," has become *d* in the Gothic *fidvôr* instead of *th*; but in High German has entirely disappeared. The *p* of the Sanskṛit root स्वप् *swap*, (Latin *sopio*,) "sleep," has been preserved in the Gothic *slêpa*, and [G. Ed. p. 85.] the Old High German *slâfu* stands in the Gothic category, but the Sanskṛit root is more faithfully preserved in the Old High German in *in-suepyu* (*sopio*, see §. 86. 4.)

90. Nor have the inflexions or grammatical appendages everywhere submitted* to the law of displacement, but have, in many instances, either remained faithful to the primary sound, or have, at least, rejected the particular change prescribed by §. 87. Thus the Old High German has, in the third person, as well singular as plural, retained the original *t*; compare *hapêt*, "he has," *hapênt*, "they have," with *habet*, *habent*: the Gothic, on the contrary, says *habaith*, *haband*; the first in accordance with the law, the last in violation of it, for *habanth*. Thus, also, in the part. pres., the *t* of the old languages has become, under the influence of the preceding *n*, not *th* but *d*; the *t* of the part. pass., however, is changed before the *s* of the nom. into *th*, but before vowel termina-

---

* It would be better to regard the phenomenon here discussed by assuming *d* as the proper character of the third person in Gothic; and viewing the Old High German *t* as the regular substitute for it. The *d* has been retained in the Gothic passive also (*bair-a-da*), and the active form *bairith* is derivable from *bairid*, in that the Gothic prefers the aspirates to the medials at the end of a word. The same is the case with the part. pass., the suffix of which is, in Gothic, *da*, whence, in Old High German, in consequence of the second law for the permutation of sounds, comes *ta*; so that the old form recurs again, re-introduced by a fresh corruption.

tions, by an anomalous process, into *d*; after the same principle by which the *th* of the third person before the vowel increment of the passive is softened to *d*; so that *da**, instead of *tha*, corresponds to the Greek *το*, of *ἐτύπτετ-ο*, and to the Sanskṛit त *ta*, of अभवत *abhavata*. The Old High German, on the other hand, has preserved the original *t* in both participles: *hapêntêr*, *hapêtêr*, Gothic *habands*, genitive *habandins*; *habaiths*, gen. *habaidis*.

91. Special notice is due to the fact, that in the middle of words under the protection of a preceding consonant, the old consonant often remains without displacement, sometimes because it chimes in well with the preceding sound, sometimes because, through regard for the preceding letters, alterations have been admitted other than those which the usual practice as to displacement would lead us to expect. Mute consonants (§. 25.), among which, in [G. Ed. p. 86.] the Germanic, the *h* must be reckoned, where it is to be pronounced like our *ch*, protect a succeeding original *t*. Thus, अष्टौ *aṣhṭâu*, "eight," *ὀκτώ*, "*octo*," is in Goth. *ahtau*, in Old High German *ahtô*: नक्तम् *naktam* (adverbial accusative), "night," *νύξ*, *νυκτός*, "*nox*," "*noctis*," is in Gothic *nahts*, Old High German *naht*. The liquids, on the other hand, like the vowels, which they approach nearest of all consonants, affect a *d* or *th* after themselves. From these euphonic causes, for instance, the feminine suffix ति *ti* in Sanskṛit, in Greek *σις*, as *ποίησις*, which designates abstract substantives, appears in Gothic in three forms, *ti*, *di*, and *thi*. The original form *ti* shews itself after *f*, into which *p* and *b* mostly resolve themselves, and also after *s* and *h*; for instance, *anst(i)s* (§. 117.), "grace," from the root *an*, Old High German *unnan*, "to be gracious," with the insertion of an euphonic *s*: *fralust(i)s*, "loss," (from *lus*, pres. *liusa*): *maht(i)s*, "strength," (from *magan*): *fra-gift(i)s*," betrothment," (from *gib*, *gaf*), also *fragibts*, perhaps erroneously, as *b* has little

---

* *Da* is an abbreviation of *dai* = G. *ται* Sansk. *tê*, see §. 466.

affinity with *t*: *ga-skaft(i)s*, "creation," (from *skap-an*). The form *di* finds its place after vowels, but is able, where the vowel of the suffix falls away, *i. e.* in the nom. and accus. sing., to convert *d* into *th*, because *th* can, more easily than *d*, dispense with a following vowel, and is a favourite letter at the end of words and before consonants, though *d* also is tolerated in such a position. Hence the root *bud*, "to bid," (pres. *biuda*, §. 27.) forms, in the uninflected condition of the pret., *bauth*, in the plur. *bud-um*; and the nominal base, *mana-sê-di*, "world," (according to Grimm's well-founded interpretation, "seed, not seat, of man,") forms in the nom. and accus. *mana-sêths*, *mana-sêth*, or *mana-sêds*, *mana-sêd;* but in the dat. *mana-sêdai* not *-sêthai*. On the other hand, after liquids the suffix is usually *thi*, and after *n*, *di*: the dental, however, once chosen, remains afterwards in every position, either without a vowel or before vowels; for instance, *gabaurths*, "birth," dat. *gabaurthai*; *gafaurds*, "gathering" [G. Ed. p. 87.] (from *far-yan*, "to go"), gen. *gafaurdais:* *gakunths*, "esteem," gen. *gakunthais*; *gamunds*, "memory," gen. *gamundais*; *gaqvumths*, "meeting," dat. *gaqvumthai*, dat. plur. *gaqvumthim*. From the union with *m*, *d* is excluded. On the whole, however, the law here discussed accords remarkably with a similar phenomenon in modern Persian, where the original *t* of grammatical terminations and suffixes is maintained only after mute consonants, but after vowels and liquids is changed into *d*: hence, for instance, *girif-tan*, "to take," *bas-tan*, "to bind," *dâsh-tan*, "to have," *pukh-tan*, "to cook": on the other hand, *dâ-dan*, "to give," *bur-dan*, "to bear," *âm-dan*, "to come." I do not, therefore, hesitate to release the Germanic suffix *ti*, and all other suffixes originally commencing with *t*, from the general law of substitution of sounds, and to assign the lot of this *t* entirely to the controul of the preceding letter. The Old High German, in the case of our suffix *ti*, as in that of other suffixes and terminations originally commencing with *t*, accords to the original *t* a far more extensive prevalence, than does the Gothic; inasmuch as it retains that letter, not only when protected by *s*, *h*, and *f*, but also after vowels and liquids—after *m* an euphonic *f* is inserted;—and the *t* is only after *l* changed into *d*. Hence, for instance, *ans-t*, "grace," *hlouft*, "course," *mah-t*, "might," *sâ-t*, "seed," *kipurt*, "birth," *var-t*, "journey," *mun-t*, "protection," *ki-wal-t*, "force," *scul-t*, *schuld*, "guilt," *chumft*, "arrival."

92. The law of substitution shews the greatest pertinacity at the beginning of words, and I have found it everywhere observed in the relation of the Gothic to the Greek and Latin. On the other hand, in some roots which are either deficient or disfigured in the Old European languages, but which are common to the Germanic and the Sanskṛit, the Gothic stands on the same footing with [G. Ed. p. 88.] the Sanskṛit, especially in respect of initial medials. Thus, बन्ध् *bandh*, "to bind," is also *band* in Gothic, not *pand*; ग्रह् *grah*, in the Vedas ग्रभ् *grabh*, "to take," "seize," is *grip* (pres. *greipa* with Guna, §. 27.) not *krip*;* to गा *gâ* and गम् *gam*, "to go," correspond *gagya*, "I go," and *ga-tvô*, "street;" दह् *dah*, "to burn," is, in Old High German, *dahan* (δαιω), "to burn," "to light." I can detect, however, no instance in which Gothic tenues correspond to Sanskṛit as initial letters.

93(a). We return now to the Sanskṛit, in order, with relation to the most essential laws of sound, to notice one adverted to in our theory of single letters; where it was said of several concurrent consonants that they were tolerated neither at the end of words, nor in the middle before strong consonants, and how their places were supplied in such situations. It is besides to be observed, that, properly, tenues alone can terminate a Sanskṛit word; but medials, only before sonants, (§. 25,) may either be retained, if they originally terminate an inflective base, or take the place of a tenuis or an aspirate, if these happen to precede sonants in a sentence. As examples, we select हरित् *harit*, (*viridis*), "green," वेदविद् *vêda-vid*, "skilled in the Vêda," धनलभ् *dhana-labh*, "acquiring wealth." These words are, according to §. 94., without a nominative sign. We find, also, अस्ति हरित् *asti harit*, "he is green," अस्ति वेदवित् *asti vedâ-vit*, अस्ति धनलप् *asti dhana-lap*; on the other hand, हरिद् अस्ति *harid asti*, वेदविद् अस्ति *vedavid asti*, धनलब् अस्ति *dhana-lab asti*; also, हरिद् भवति *harid bhavati*, &c. With this Sanskṛit law the Middle High [G. Ed. p. 89.] German is very nearly in accordance, which indeed tolerates aspirates at the end of words, contrary to the custom of the Sanskṛit, only with a conversion of the sonant *v* into the surd *f*, see §. 86. 3.; but, like the Sanskṛit, and independent of the law of displacement explained in §. 87., supplies the place of medials at the end of words regularly by tenues. As, for example, in the genitives *tages*, *eides*, *wîbes*, of which the nom. and accus. sing., deprived of the inflexion and the terminating vowel of the base, take the forms *tac*, (§. 86. 1.) *eit*, *wîp*. So also as to the verb; for instance, the roots *trag*, *lad*, *grab*, form, in the uninflected 1st and 3d pers. sing. pret., *truoc*, *luot*, *gruop*, plur. *truogen*, *luoden*, *gruoben*. Where, on the other hand, the tenuis or aspirate (*v* excepted) is radical, there no alteration of sound occurs in declension or in conjugation. For instance, *wort*, gen. *wortes*, not *wordes*, as in Sansk. ददत् *dadat*, "the giver," gen. ददतस् *dadatas*, not दददस् *dadadas*, but वित् *vit*, "knowing," gen. विदस् *vidas*, from the base विद् *vid*. In Old High German different authorities of the language are at variance with respect to the strict observance of this law. Isidor is in accordance with it, insomuch that he converts *d* at the end into *t*, and *g* into *c*; for instance, *wort*, *wordes*; *dac*, *dages*. The Gothic excludes only the labial medials from terminations, but replaces them, not by tenues, but by aspirates. Hence *gaf*, "I gave," in contrast to *gêbum*, and the accusatives *hlaif*, *lauf*, *thiuf*, opposed to the nominatives *hlaibs*, *laubs*, *thiubs*, gen. *hlaibis*, &c. The guttural and dental medials (*g*, *d*) are tolerated by the Gothic in terminations; yet even in these, in individual cases, a preference appears for the terminating aspirates. Compare *bauth*, "I or he offered," with *budum*, "we offered," from the root *bud*; *haitad-a* "*nominatur*" with *haitith* (§. 67.) "*nominat; aih*, "I have," "he has," with *aigum*, "we have."

---

* The Latin *prehendo* is probably related to the Sanskṛit root ग्रह् *grah*, through the usual interchange between gutturals and labials.

[G. Ed. p. 90.] 93(^{b}). In a sense also opposed to that of the above-mentioned Sanskṛit law, we find, in Old High German, yet only in Notker, an euphonic relation between terminating and initial letters of two words which come together. (Grimm, pp. 130, 138, 181). As in Sanskṛit the tenuis appears as an essential consonant, fit for the conclusion of a sentence, but exchangeable, under the influence of a word following in a sentence, for the medials; so with Notker the tenuis ranks as a true initial; stands therefore at the beginning of a sentence, and after strong consonants; but after vowels and the weakest consonants the liquid is turned into a medial. Thus, for instance, *ih pin*, "I am," but *ih ne bin; ter dag*, "the day," but *tes tages; mit kote*, "with God," but *minan got*, "my God."

94. Two consonants are no longer, in the existing condition of the Sanskṛit, tolerated at the end of a word, but the latter of the two is rejected. This emasculation, which must date from an epoch subsequent to the division of the language, as this law is not recognised either by the Zend or by any of the European branches of the family, has had, in many respects, a disadvantageous operation on the Grammar, and has mutilated many forms of antiquity required by theory. In the High German we may view, as in some degree connected with this phenomenon, the circumstance that roots with double liquids—*ll, mm, nn, rr*—in forms which are indeclinable (and before the consonants of inflexions) reject the latter of the pair. In the case, also, of terminations in double *h* or *t*, one is rejected. Hence, for instance, from *stihhu* (*pungo*) *ar-prittu* (*stringo*), the 1st and 3d pers. pret. *stah, ar-prat*. In Middle High German,

in declensions in *ck*, *ff*, the last is rejected; for instance, *boc*, gen. *bockes*; *grif*, *griffes*: *tz* loses the *t*; for instance, *schaz*, *schatzes*.

95. Between a final न् *n* and a succeeding [G. Ed. p. 91.] *t* sound — as which the palatals also must be reckoned, for च् *ch* is equivalent to *tsh*—in the Sanskṛit an euphonic sibilant is interposed, from the operation of the following *t*; and न्, by this sibilant, is converted, §. 9., into Anuswâra; for instance, अभवंस् तत्र *abhavaṅs tatra*, (*abhavan-s-tatra*), "they were there." With this coincides the circumstance, that, in High German, between a radical *n* and the *t* of an affix, an *s*, in certain cases, is inserted; for instance, from the root *ann*, "to favour," comes, in Old High German, *an-s-t*, "thou favourest," *on-s-ta* or *onda*, "I favoured," *an-s-t*, "favour"; from *prann* comes *prun-s-t*, "ardour"; from *chan* is derived *chun-s-t*, "knowledge," our German Kunst, in which, as in Brunst and Gunst, (from *gönnen*, probably formed from the *ann* before noticed, and the preposite *g*(*e*),) the euphonic *s* has stood fast. The Gothic exhibits this phenomenon nowhere, perhaps, but in *an-s-ts* and *allbrun-s-ts* 'holocaustum.' In Old High German we find still an *s* inserted after *r*, in the root *tarr*; hence, *tar-s-t*, "thou darest," *tor-s-ta*, I dared." (Cf. §. 616. 2d Note.)

96. In Sanskṛit the interposed euphonic *s* has extended itself further only among the prefixed prepositions, which generally enter into most intimate and facile connection with the following root. In this manner the euphonic *s* steps in between the prepositions सम् *sam*, अव *ava*, परि *pari*, प्रति *prati*, and certain words which begin with क *k*. With this the Latin *s* between *ab* or *ob* and *c*, *q*, and *p*, remarkably accords*,
[G. Ed. p. 92.] which *s*, *ab* retains even in an isolated position, when the above-mentioned letters follow. To this we also refer the *cosmittere* of Festus, instead of *committere*

---

* We scarcely think it necessary to defend ourselves for dividing, with Vossius, *ob-solesco*, rather than with Schneider (p. 571) *obs-olesco*.

(Schneider, p. 475), unless an original *smitto*, for *mitto*, is involved in this compound. In the Greek, ς shews an inclination for connection with τ, θ, and μ, and precedes these letters as an euphonic link, especially after short vowels, in cases which require no special mention. In compounds like σακες-πάλος I reckon the ς, in opposition to the common theory, as belonging to the base of the first member (§. 128.). We have yet to consider a case of the interpolation of an euphonic labial, which is common to the Old Latin and Germanic, and serves to facilitate the union of the labial nasal with a dental. The Latin places *p* between *m* and a following *t* or *s*; the Gothic and Old High German *f* between *m* and *t*. Thus, *sumpsi, prompsi, dempsi, sumptus, promptus*; *demptus*; Gothic *andanum-f-ts*, "acceptance"; Old High German *chum-f-t*, "arrival." In Greek we find also the interpolation of an euphonic β after μ, of a δ after ν, of a θ after σ, in order to facilitate the union of μ, ν, and σ with ρ and λ (μεσημβρία, μέμβλεται, ἀνδρός, ἱμάσθλη—see Buttman, p. 80); while the Modern Persian places an euphonic *d* between the vowel of a prefixed preposition and that of the following word, as *be-d-û*, "to him."

97. The Greek affords few specimens of variability at the end of words, excepting from peculiarities of dialect, as the substitution of ρ for ς. The alteration of the ν in the article in old inscriptions, and in the prefixes σύν, ἐν, and πάλιν, seems analogous to the changes which, according to §. 18., the terminating म् *m*, in Sanskṛit, undergoes in all cases, with reference to the letter which follows. [G. Ed. p. 93.] The concluding ν in Greek is also generally a derivative from μ, and corresponds to this letter, which the Greek never admits as a termination in analogous forms of the Sanskṛit, Zend, and Latin. N frequently springs from a final ς; thus, for instance, μεν (Doric μες) and the dual τον answer to the Sanskṛit personal terminations मस् *mas*, थस् *thas*, तस् *tas*. I have found this explanation, which I have given elsewhere, of the origin of the ν from ς

subsequently confirmed by the Prâkṛit, in which, in like manner, the concluding *s* of the instrumental termination plural भिस् *bhis* has passed into the dull *ṅ* (Anuswâra, §. 9.), and हिं *hiṅ* is said for *bhis*. An operation, which has a prejudicial effect on many Greek terminations, and disturbs the relation to cognate languages, is the suppression of the *t* sound at the end of words, where, in Sanskṛit, Zend, and Latin it plays an essential part. In respect of the vowels, it is also worthy of notice, that in Sanskṛit, but not in Zend, at the meeting of vowel terminations and commencements, a hiatus is guarded against, either by the fusion of the two vowels, or, in cases where the vowel has a cognate semi-vowel at its command, by its transition into this latter, provided the vowel following be unlike. We find, for instance, अस्तीदम् *astîdam*, "*est hoc*," and अस्त्य् अयम् *asty ayam*, "*est hic.*" For the sake of clearness, and because the junction of two vowels might too often give the appearance of two or more words to one, I write in my most recent text अस्ती ’दम्, in order, by an apostrophe which I employ as a sign of fusion, to indicate that the vowel which appears wanting in the दम् *dam* is contained in the final vowel of the preceding word. We might, perhaps, still better write अस्ती˜ ’दम्, in order directly [G. Ed. p. 94.] at the close of the first word to shew that its final vowel has arisen out of a contraction, and that the following word participates in it.*

98. We have now to consider the alterations in the middle of words, *i.e.* those of the final letters of the roots and nominal bases before grammatical endings, and we find, with respect to these, most life, strength, and consciousness in the Sanskṛit; and this language is

---

* We cannot guide ourselves here by the original MSS., as these exhibit no separation of words, and entire verses are written together without interruption, as though they were only a series of senseless syllables, and not words of independent place and meaning. As we must depart from Indian practice, the more complete the more rational the separation.

placed on the highest point of antiquity, insomuch as the signification of every radical portion is still so strongly felt, that while it admits of moderate changes, for the avoiding of harshness, it never, if we except some vowel elisions, permits the radical sense to be obliterated, or rendered irrecognisable by concessions too great, or transitions too daring. Yet does the Sanskṛit, more than any of its kindred, afford a field for the conflict of unsociable consonants, a conflict, however, which is honourably and strenuously maintained. The Vowels and weak consonants, (§. 25.) of grammatical endings and suffixes exert no influence over preceding consonants; but strong consonants, if surd (§. 25.), require a tenuis, and if sonant a medial, before them. Thus, त् *t* and थ् *th* allow only of क् *k*, not ख् *kh*, ग् *g*, घ् *gh* preceding them; only त् *t*, not थ् *th*, द् *d*, ध् *dh*; while on the other hand, ध् *dh* allows only ग् *g*, not क् *k*, ख् *kh*, घ् *gh*; only द् *d*, not त् *t*, थ् *th*, ध् *dh*; only ब् *b*, not प् *p*, फ् *ph*, भ् *bh* to precede it. The [G. Ed. p. 95.] roots and the nominal bases have to regulate their final letters by this law; and the occasion frequently presents itself, since, in comparison with the cognate languages, a far greater proportion of the roots connect the personal terminations immediately with the root; and also among the case terminations there are many which begin with consonants (भ्याम् *bhyâm*, भिस् *bhis*, भ्यस् *bhyas*, सु *su*). To cite instances, the root अद् *ad*, "to eat," forms अद्मि *admi*, "I eat"; but not अद्सि *adsi* (for *s* is surd), nor अद्ति *ad-ti*, अद्थ *ad-tha*, but अत्सि *at-si*, अत्ति *at-ti*, अत्थ *at-tha*: on the other hand, in the imperative, अद्धि *ad-dhi*, "eat." The base पद् *pad*, "foot," forms, in the locative plural, पत्सु *pat-su*, not पद्सु *pad-su*; on the other hand, महत् *mahat*, "great," forms, in the instrumental plural, महद्भिस् *mahad-bhis* not महत्भिस् *mahat-bhis*.

99. The Greek and Latin, as they have come down to us, have either altogether evaded this conflict of consonants, or exhibit, in most cases, with regard to the first of any two contiguous consonants, a disposition to surrender it, or

at least an indifference to its assistance towards the signification of the word, since they either abandon it altogether, or violently alter it, *i.e.* convey it beyond the limits of its proper organ. These two languages afford fewer occasions for harsh unions of consonants than the Sanskṛit, principally because, with the exception of 'ΕΣ and 'ΙΔ in Greek, and *ES, FER, VEL, ED,* in Latin, as *ἐσ-τί, ἐσ-μέν, ἐσ-τέ, ἴδ-μεν, ἴσ-τε, est, estis, fer-t, fer-tis, vul-t, vul-tis,* no root, terminated by a consonant, joins on its personal terminations, or any of them, without the aid of a connecting vowel. The Greek perf. pass. makes an exception, and requires euphonic alterations, which, in part, come within the natūral limits recognised by the Sanskṛit, and, in part, overstep them.

[G. Ed. p. 96.] The gutturals and labials remain on the ancient footing, and before *σ* and *τ* observe the Sanskṛit law of sound cited in §. 98.; according to which *κ-σ*(*ξ*), *κ-τ, π-σ, π-τ,* are applied to roots ending in *κ, γ, χ,* or *π, β, φ,* because the surd *σ* or *τ* suffers neither medials nor aspirates before it; hence *τέτριπ-σαι, τέτριπ-ται,* from ΤΡΙΒ, *τέτυκ-σαι, τέτυκ-ται,* from ΤΥΧ. The Greek, however, diverges from the Sanskṛit in this, that *μ* does not leave the consonant which precedes it unaltered, but assimilates labials to itself, and converts the guttural, tenuis and aspirate into medials. For *τέτυμ-μαι, τέτριμ-μαι, πέπλεγ-μαι, τέτυγ-μαι,* we should, on Sanskṛit principles, write (§. 98.) *τέτυπ-μαι, τέτριβ-μαι, πεπλεκ-μαι, τετυχ-μαι.* The *t* sounds carry concession too far, and abandon the Sanskṛit, or original principle, as regards the gutturals; inasmuch as *δ, θ,* and *ζ* (*δσ*), instead of passing into *τ* before *σ* and *τ*, are extinguished before *σ*, and before *τ* and *μ* become *σ* (*πέπεισ-ται, πέπει-σαι, πέπεισ-μαι,* instead of *πέπειτ-ται, πέπειτ-σαι, πεπειθ-μαι,* or *πεπειδ-μαι.* The Greek declension affords occasion for the alteration of consonants only through the *ς* of the nominative and the dative plural termination in *σι*; and here the same principle holds good as in the case of the verb, and in the formation of words: *kh* and *g* become, as in Sanskṛit, *k* (*ξ*=*κ-ς*), and *b* and *ph* become *p*.

The *t* sounds, on the other hand, contrary to the Sanskṛit, and in accordance with the enfeebled condition, in this respect, of the Greek, vanish entirely. We find *πού-ς* for *πότ-ς*, *που-σί* for *ποτ-σί*, which latter naturally and originally must have stood for *ποδ-σ*, *ποδ-σι*.

100. In Latin the principal occasion for the alteration of consonants presents itself before the *s* of the perfect and the *t* of the supine, or other verbal substantive or adjective (participles) beginning with *t*; and it is in [G. Ed. p. 97.] accordance with the Sanskṛit law cited §. 98., and the original condition of the language, that the sonant guttural passes, before *s* and *t*, into *c*, the sonant labial into *p*, as in *rec-si* (*rexi*), *rectum* from *reg*, *scripsi*, *scriptum* from *scrib*. It is also in accordance with the Sanskṛit that *h*, as a sonant (§. 25.) and incompatible with a tenuis, becomes *c* before *s* and *t*; compare *vec-sit* (*vexit*), with the word of like signification अवाक्षीत् *a-vâk-ṣhît*. If of the two final consonants of a root the last vanishes before the *s* of the perfect tense (*mulsi* from *mulc* and *mulg*, *sparsi* from *sparg*), this accords with the Sanskṛit law of sounds, by which, of two terminating consonants of a nominal base, the last vanishes before consonants of the case terminations. *D* ought to become *t* before *s*; and then the form, so theoretically created, *claut-sit* from *claud*, would accord with the Sanskṛit forms, such as अतौत्सीत् *a-tâut-sît*, "he tormented," from तुद् *tud*. Instead, however, of this, the *d* allows itself to be extinguished; so, however, that, in compensation, a short vowel of the root is made long, as *di-vī-si*; or, which is less frequent, the *d* assimilates itself to the following *s*, as *cessi* from *ced*. With roots in *t*, which are rarer, assimilation usually takes place, as *con-cus-si* from *cut*; on the other hand, *mī-si*, not *mis-si*, for *mit-si*, from *mit* or *mitt*. *B*, *m*, and *r* also afford instances of assimilation in *jus-si*, *pres-si*, *ges-si*, *us-si*.* A third resource, for the avoidance

---

* Compared with the Sanskṛit, in which उष् *uṣh* signifies "burn"; the sibilant must here pass for the original form.

of an union, very natural, but not endurable in this weakened state of the language, *ts*, is the suppression of the latter of these two letters, which is also compensated by the lengthening of a short radical vowel; thus,* *sēdi* from [G. Ed. p. 98.] *sĕd*, *vīdi* from *vĭd*. I believe, at least, that these forms are not derivable from *sedui*, *vidui*, and I class them with forms like *fōdi* from *fŏd*, *lēgi*, for *lec-si*, from *lĕg*, *fugi*, for *fuc-si*, from *fŭg*. To these probably also belong *cāvi*, *fāvi*, *fōvi*, for *pāvi*, *vōvi*, from *căv*, &c. A *cavui*, &c. is hardly conceivable; *cavi* could never have had such an origin. I conjecture forms such as *cau-si*, *fau-si*, after the analogy of *cautum*, *fautum*; or *moc-si* (*moxi*), after the analogy of *vic-si*, *con-nic-si*. (§. 19.) Possibly a *moc-si* form might derive probability from the adverb *mox*, since the latter is probably derived from *mov*, as *cito* is from another root of motion. The *c* of *fluc-si*, *struc-si*, (*fluxi*, &c.) *fluxum*, *structum*, must, in the same manner, be considered as a hardening of *v*; and a *flu-vo*, *stru-vo*, be presupposed, with regard to which it is to be remembered, that, in Sanskṛit also, *uv* often developes itself out of उ *u* before vowels (Gram. Crit. r. 50.^{b}); on which principle, out of *flu*, *stru*, before vowels, we might obtain *fluv*, *struv*, and thence before consonants *fluc*, *struc*. Thus, also, *fructus* out of *fruv-or* for *fru-or*. In cases of *t* preceded by consonants, the suppression of *s* is the rule, and *ar-si* for *ard-i* an exception. *Prandi*, *frendi*, *pandi*, *verti*, &c., are in contrast to *ar-si* and other forms, like *mulsi* above mentioned, in their preserving the radical letter in preference to the auxiliary verb; and they accord in this with the Sanskṛit rule of sound, by which the *s* of अतौत्सम् *atâut-sam*, अक्षैप्सम् *akshaip-sam*, &c., for the avoidance of hardness, is suppressed before strong consonants, and we find, for instance, अतौत्त *atâut-ta*, instead of अतौत्स्त *atâut-sta*. The perfects *scĭdi*, *fĭdi*, are rendered doubtful by their short vowel, and in their origin probably belong to the reduplicated preterites, their first syllable having perished in the lapse of time: in other [G. Ed. p. 99.] respects, *fĭdi, scĭdi,* correspond to *tutŭdi, pupŭgi,* not to speak of *tetĭgi,* the *i* of which latter is not original.

---

* Cf. §. 547., and for the whole §. cf. §§. 547. 576. 579.

101. The suffixes employed in the formation of words and beginning with *t,* for the representation of which the supine may stand, deserve special consideration, in regard to the relations of sound generated by the conflict between *t* and the preceding consonant. According to the original law observed in the Sanskṛit, a radical *t* ought to remain unaltered before *tum,* and *d* should pass into *t*; as, भेत्तुम् *bhêttum,* "to cleave," from भिद् *bhid.* According to the degenerated practice of the Greek, a radical *d* or *t* before *t* would become *s.* Of this second gradation we find a remnant in *comes-tus, comes-tura,* analogous to *es-t, es-tis,* &c. from *edo:* we find, however, no *comes-tum, comes-tor,* but in their place *comesum, comesor.* We might question whether, in *comēsum,* the *s* belonged to the root or to the suffix; whether the *d* of *ed,* or the *t* of *tum,* had been changed into *s.* The form *com-es-tus* might argue the radicality of the *s*; but it is hard to suppose that the language should have jumped at once from *estus* to *ēsus,* between which two an *essus* probably intervened, analogous to *cessum, fissum, quassum,* &c., while the *t* of *tum, tus,* &c., assimilated itself to the preceding *s.* Out of *essum* has arisen *ēsum,* by the suppression of an *s,* probably the first; for where of a pair of consonants the one is removed, it is generally the first, (*εἰμί* from *ἐσμί, πο-σί* from *ποδ-σί,*) possibly because, as in §. 100., an auxiliary verb is abandoned in preference to a letter of the main verb. After that the language had, through such forms as *ē-sum, cā-sum, divī-sum, fis-sum, quas-sum,* habituated itself to an *s* in suffixes properly beginning with a *t, s* might easily insinuate itself into forms where it did not owe its origin to assimilation. *Cs* (*x*) is a [G. Ed. p. 100.] favourite combination; hence, *fic-sum, nec-sum,* &c. for *fic-tum, nec-tum.* The liquids, *m* excepted, evince special incli-

nation for a succeeding *s*, most of all the *r*; hence, *ter-sum*, *mer-sum*, *cur-sum*, *par-sum*, *ver-sum*, in contrast to *par-tum*, *tor-tum*: there are also cases in which *r*, by a conversion into *s*, accommodates itself to *t*, as in *ges-tum*, *us-tum*, *tos-tum*.* This answers to the Sanskrit obligatory conversion of a concluding *r* into *s* before an initial *t*; as, भ्रातस् तारय माम् *bhrâtas târaya mâm*, "brother save me," instead of भ्रातर् *bhrâtar*: on the other hand, in the middle of words *r* remains unaltered before *t*; hence, for instance, भर्तुम् *bhartum*, not भस्तुम् *bhastum*, "to bear." *L* exhibits in the Latin the forms *fal-sum*, *pul-sum*, *vul-sum*, in contrast to *cul-tum*; *n* exhibits *ten-tum*, *can-tum*, opposed to *man-sum*. The other forms in *n-sum*, except *cen-sum*, have been mulcted of a radical *d*, as *ton-sum*, *pen-sum*.

102. In the Germanic languages, *t* alone gives occasion for an euphonic conversion of a preceding radical consonant; for instance, in the 2d pers. sing. of the strong preterite, where, however, the *t* in the Old High German is retained only in a few verbs, which associate a present signification with the form of the preterite. In the weak preterites, also, which spring from these verbs, the auxiliary *t*, where it remains unaltered, generates the same euphonic relations. We find in these forms the Germanic on the same footing as the Greek, in this respect, that it converts radical *t* sounds (*t*, *th*, *d*, and in Old and Middle High German *z* also) before a superadded *t* into *s*. Hence, for instance, in [G. Ed. p. 101.] Gothic *maimais-t* (*abscidisti*), for *maimait-t*, *fai-fals-t* (*plicavisti*), for *fai-falth-t*, *ana-baus-t* (*imperasti*), for *ana-baud-t*. In Old and Middle High German *weis-t*, "thou knowest," for *weiz-t*. The Gothic, in forming out of the root *vit*, in the weak preterite, *vis-sa* ("I knew"), instead of

---

* The obvious relationship of *torreo* with τέρσομαι, and तृष् *tṛish* from तर्ष् *tarṣh*, argues the derivation of the latter *r* from *s*. Upon that of *uro* from उष् *uṣh*, see §. 97.

vista, from *vitta*, resembles, in respect of assimilation, the Latin forms mentioned in §. 101., such as *quas-sum* for *quastum*, from *quat-tum*. The Old High German, however, which also adopts *wis-sa*, but from *muoz* makes not *muos-sa*, but *muo-sa*, corresponds, in the latter case, to such Latin forms, as *ca-sum*, *clau-sum*. The case is different in Old High German with those verbs of the first weak conjugation, which, having their syllables made long generally through two terminating consonants in the preterite, apply the *t* of the auxiliary verb directly to the root. Here the transition of *t* into *s* does not occur, but *t*, *z*, and even *d*, remain unaltered; and only when another consonant precedes them *t* and *d* are extinguished, *z* on the contrary remains; for instance, *leit-ta*, "DUXI," *ki-neiz-ta*, "AFFLIXI," *ar-ôd-ta*, "VASTAVI," *walz-ta*, "VOLVI," *liuh-ta*, "LUXI," for *liuht-ta*; *hul-ta*, "PLACAVI," for *huld-ta*. Of double consonants one only is retained, and of *ch* or *cch* only *h*; other consonantal combinations remain, however, undisturbed, as *ran-ta*, "CUCURRI," for *rann-ta*; *wanh-ta*, "VACILLAVI," for *wanch-ta*; *dah-ta*, "TEXI," for *dacch-ta*. The Middle High German follows essentially the same principles, only a simple radical *t* gives way before the auxiliary verb, and thus *lei-te* is opposed to the Old High German *leit-ta*; on the other hand, in roots in *ld* and *rd* the *d* may be maintained, and the *t* of the auxiliary be surrendered—as *dulde*, "TOLERAVI" —unless we admit a division of *dul-de*, and consider the *d* as a softened *t*. The change of *g* into *c* (§. 98.) is natural, but not universal; for instance, *anc-te*, "ARCTAVI," for *ang-te*; but against this law *b* remains unaltered. [G. Ed. p. 102.] Before the formative suffixes beginning with *t**, both in Gothic and High German, guttural and labial tenues and medials are changed into their aspirates, although the tenuis accord with a following *t*. Thus, for instance, in Gothic, *vah-tvô*,

---

* With the exception of the High German passive part. of the weaker form, which, in the adjunction of its *t* to the root, follows the analogy of the pret. above described.

OF THE ROOTS.

[G. Ed. p. 105.] 105. There are in Sanskṛit, and the languages which are akin to it, two classes of roots: from the one, which is by far the more numerous, spring verbs, and nouns (substantives and adjectives) which stand in fraternal connection with the verbs, not in the relation of descent from them, not begotten by them, but sprung from the same shoot with them. We term them, nevertheless, for the sake of distinction, and according to prevailing custom, Verbal Roots; and the verb, too, stands in close formal connection with them, because from many roots each person of the present is formed by simply adding the requisite personal termination. From the second class spring pronouns, all original prepositions, conjunctions, and particles: we name them Pronominal Roots, because they all express a pronominal idea, which, in the prepositions, conjunctions, and particles, lies more or less concealed. No simple pronouns can be carried back, either according to their meaning or their form, to any thing more general, but their declension-theme (or inflective base) is at the same time their root. The Indian Grammarians, however, derive all words, the pronouns included, from verbal roots, although the majority of pronominal bases, even in a formal respect, are opposed to such a derivation, because they, for the most part, end with *a*: one, indeed, consists simply of *a*. Among [G. Ed. p. 106.] the verbal roots, however, there is not a single one in *ă*, although long *a*, and all other vowels, औ *âu* excepted, occur among the final letters of the verbal roots. Accidental external identity takes place between the verbal and pronominal roots; *e.g.* इ *i* signifies, as a verbal root, "to go," as a pronominal root, "he," "this."

106. The verbal roots, like those of the pronouns, are

monosyllabic; and the polysyllabic forms represented by the grammarians as roots contain either a reduplicate-syllable, as जागृ *jâgṛi*, "to wake," or a preposition which has grown up with the root, as अवधीर् *ava-dhîr*, "to despise"; or they have sprung from a noun, like कुमार् *kumâr*, "to play," which I derive from कुमार *kumâra*, "a boy." Except the law of their being monosyllabic, the Sanskṛit roots are subjected to no further limitation, and their one-syllableness may present itself under all possible forms, in the shortest and most extended, as well as those of a middle degree. This free state of irrestriction was necessary, as the language was to contain within the limits of one-syllableness the whole body of fundamental ideas. The simple vowels and consonants were not sufficient: it was requisite to frame roots also where several consonants, combined in inseparable unity, became, as it were, simple sounds; *e.g.* स्था *sthâ*, "to stand," a root in which the age of the co-existence of the *s* and *th* is supported by the unanimous testimony of all the members of our race of languages. So also, in स्कन्द् *skand*, "to go," (Lat. *scand-o*) the age of the combination of consonants, both in the beginning and ending of the root, is certified by the agreement of the Latin with the Sanskṛit. The proposition, that in the earliest period of language a simple vowel is sufficient to express a verbal idea, is supported by the remarkable concurrence of [G. Ed. p. 107.] nearly all the individuals of the Sanskṛit family of languages in expressing the idea "to go" by the root *i*.

107. The nature and peculiarity of the Sanskṛit verbal roots explains itself still more by comparison with those of the Semitic languages. These require, as far as we trace back their antiquity, three consonants, which, as I have already elsewhere shewn,* express the fundamental

---

* Trans. of the Hist. Phil. Class of the R. A. of Litt. of Berlin for the year 1824, p. 126, &c.

idea by themselves alone, without the aid of vowels; and although they may be momentarily compressed into one syllable, still, in this, the combination of the middle radical with the first or last cannot be recognised as original and belonging to the root, because it is only transitory, and chiefly depends on the mechanism of the construction of the word. Thus, in Hebrew, *kâtûl*, "slain," in the fem., on account of the addition *âh* contracts itself to *ktûl* (*ktûl-âh*); while *kôtêl*, "slaying," before the same addition, compresses itself in an opposite manner, and forms *kôtlâh*. Neither *ktûl*, therefore, nor *kôtl*, can be regarded as the root; and just as little can it be looked for in *ktôl*, as the *status constructus* of the infinitive; for this is only a shortening of the absolute form *kâtôl*, produced by a natural tendency to pass hastily to the word governed by the infinitive, which, as it were, has grown to it. In the imperative *ktôl* the abbreviation is not external, subject to mechanical conditions, but rather dynamic, and occasioned by the hurry with which a command is usually enunciated. In the Semitic languages, in decided opposition to those of the Sanskṛit family, the vowels belong, not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of [G. Ed. p. 108.] the word. By them, for example, is distinguished, in Arabic, *katala*, "he slew," from *kutila*, "he was slain"; and in Hebrew, *kôtêl*, "slaying," from *kâtûl*, "slain." A Semitic root is unpronounceable, because, in giving it vowels, an advance is made to a special grammatical form, and it then no longer possesses the simple peculiarity of a root raised above all grammar. But in the Sanskṛit family of languages, if its oldest state is consulted in the languages which have continued most pure, the root appears as a circumscribed nucleus, which is almost unalterable, and which surrounds itself with foreign syllables, whose origin we must investigate, and whose destination is, to express the secondary ideas of grammar which the root itself cannot express.

The vowel, with one or more consonants, and sometimes without any consonant whatever, belongs to the fundamental meaning: it can be lengthened to the highest degree, or raised by Guna or Vṛiddhi; and this lengthening or raising, and, more lately, the retention of an original *a*, opposed to its weakening to *i* or change to *u* (§§. 66., 67.), belongs not to the denoting of grammatical relations, which require to be more clearly pointed out, but, as I imagine I can prove, only to the mechanism, the symmetry of construction.

108. As the Semitic roots, on account of their construction, possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal moulding of the root, of which they also make extensive use, while the Sanskṛit roots, at the first grammatical movement, are compelled to assume external additions; so must it appear strange, that F. von Schlegel,* while he [G. Ed. p. 109.] divides languages in general into two chief races, of which the one denotes the secondary intentions of meaning by an internal alteration of the sound of the root by inflexion, the other always by the addition of a word, which may by itself signify plurality, past time, what is to be in future, or other relative ideas of that kind, allots the Sanskṛit and its sisters to the former race, and the Semitic languages to the second. "There may, indeed," he writes, p. 48, "arise an appearance of inflexion, when the annexed particles are melted down with the chief word so as to be no longer distinguishable; but where in a language, as in the Arabic, and in all which are connected with it, the first and most important relations, as those of the person to verbs, are denoted by the addition of particles which have a meaning for themselves individually, and the tendency to which suffixes shews itself deeply seated in the language, it may there be safely assumed that the same may have

---

* In his work on the language and wisdom of the Indians.

occurred in other positions, where the annexation of particles of a foreign nature no longer admits of such clear discrimination: one may at least safely assume that the language, on the whole, belongs to this chief race, although in this single point, by admixture or artificial adornment, it has adopted another and a higher character." We must here preliminarily observe, that, in Sanskṛit and the languages connected with it, the personal terminations of the verbs shew at least as great a similarity to isolated pronouns as in Arabic. How should any language, which expresses the pronominal relations of the verbs by syllables annexed either at the beginning or end of the word, in the choice of these syllables avoid, and not rather select, those which, in their isolated state, also express the corresponding [G. Ed. p. 110.] pronominal ideas? By inflexion, F. von Schlegel understands the internal alteration of the sound of the root, or (p. 35) the internal modification of the root, which he (p. 48) opposes to addition from without. But when from *δο* or *δω*, in Greek, comes *δίδω-μι*, *δώ-σω*, *δο-θησόμεθα*, what are the forms *μι*, *σω*, *θησόμεθα*, but palpable external additions to the root, which is not at all internally altered, or only in the quantity of the vowel? If, then, by inflexion, an internal modification of the root is to be understood, the Sanskṛit and Greek &c. have in that case—except the reduplication, which is supplied by the elements of the root itself—scarce any inflexion at all to shew. If, however, *θησόμεθα* is an external modification of the root *δο*, simply because it is combined with it, touches it, with it expresses a whole; then the idea of sea and continent may be represented as an internal modification of the sea, and *vice versâ*. P. 50, F. von Schlegel remarks: "In the Indian or Grecian language every root is truly that which the name says, and like a living germ; for since the ideas of relation are denoted by internal alteration, freer room is given for development, the fulness of which can be indefinitely extended, and is, in fact, often wondrously rich. All, however, which in this manner proceeds from the simple root, still retains the stamp of its relationship, adheres to it, and thus reciprocally bears and supports itself." I find, however, the inference not established; for from the capability of expressing ideas of relation by internal alteration of the root, how can the capability be deduced of surrounding the (internally unalterable) root indefinitely, with foreign syllables externally added? What kind of stamp of relationship is there between *μι*, *σω*, *θησόμεθα*, and the [G. Ed. p. 111.] roots to which these significative additions are appended? We therefore recognise in the inflexions of the Sanskṛit family of languages no internal involutions of the root, but elements of themselves significative, and the tracing of the origin of which is the task of scientific grammar. But even if the origin of not a single one of these inflexions could be traced with certainty, still the principle of the formation of grammar, by external addition, would not, for that reason, be the less certain, because, at the first glance, in the majority of inflexions, one discovers at least so much, that they do not belong to the root, but have been added from without. A. W. von Schlegel, also, who, in essential points, assents to the above-mentioned division of languages,* gives us to understand, with regard to the so-called inflexions, that they are not modifications of the root, but foreign additions, whose characteristic lies in this, that [G. Ed. p. 112.] regarded, *per se*, they have no meaning. In the Semitic, the appended grammatical syllables or inflexions have no meaning, at least in so far that they do not, any more than in Sanskṛit, occur isolated in a completely similar state. In Arabic, for instance, *antum*, and not *tum*, is said for "ye"; and in Sanskṛit *ma*, *ta*, and not *mi*, *ti*, are the declinable bases of the first and third person; and *at-Ti*, "he eats," has the same relation to *TA-m*, "him," that in Gothic *IT-a*, "I eat," has to the monosyllabic *AT*, "I ate." The reason for weakening the *a* of the base to *i* is probably, in the different cases of the two sister languages, the same, viz. the greater extent of the form of word with *i* (comp. §. 6.) If, then, the division of languages made by F. von Schlegel is untenable, on the reasons on which it is founded, still there is much ingenuity in the thought of a natural history or classification of languages. We prefer, however, to present, with A. W. von Schlegel (l. c.), three classes, and distinguish them as follows: first, languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of composition, and hence without organism, without grammar. This class comprises Chinese, where all is hitherto bare root, and the grammatical categories, and secondary relations after the

---

* Nevertheless, in his work, "*Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales*," p. 14, &c., he gives three classes, viz. *Les langues sans aucune structure grammaticale, les langues qui emploient des affixes, et les langues à inflexions.* Of the latter, he says: "Je pense, cependant, qu'il faut assigner le premier rang aux langues à inflexions. On pourroit les appeler les langues organiques, parce qu'elles renferment un principe vivant de développement et d'accroissement, et qu'elles ont seules, si je puis m'exprimer ainsi, une végétation abondante et féconde. Le merveilleux artifice de ces langues est, de former une immense variété de mots, et de marquer la liaison des idées que ces mots désignent, moyennant un assez petit nombre de syllabes qui, considérées séparément, n'ont point de signification

---

fication, mais qui déterminent avec précision le sens du mot auquel elles sont jointes. En modifiant les lettres radicales, et en ajoutant aux racines des syllabes dérivatives, on forme de mots dérivés de diverses espèces, et des dérivés des dérivés. On compose des mots de plusieurs racines pour exprimer les idées complexes. Ensuite on décline les substantifs, les adjectifs, et les pronoms, par genres, par nombres, et par cas; on conjugue les verbes par voix, par modes, par temps, par nombres, et par personnes, en employant de même des désinences et quelquefois des augmens qui, séparément, ne signifient rien. Cette méthode procure l'avantage d'énoncer en un seul mot l'idée principale, souvent déjà très-modifiée et très-complexe, avec tout son cortége d'idées accessoires et de relations variables.

main point, can only be discovered from the position of the roots in the sentence.* Secondly, languages with monosyllabic roots, which are capable of combination, and obtain their organism and grammar nearly in this way alone. The chief principle of the formation of words, in this class, appears to me to lie in the combination of verbal and pronominal roots, which together represent, [G. Ed. p. 113.] as it were, body and soul (Comp. §. 100.). To this class belongs the Sanskṛit family of languages, and moreover all other languages, so far as they are not comprehended under 1. and 3., and have maintained themselves in a condition which renders it possible to trace back their forms of words to the simplest elements. Thirdly, languages with dissyllabic verbal roots, and three necessary consonants as single vehicles of the fundamental meaning. This class comprehends merely the Semitic languages, and produces its grammatical forms, not simply by combination, like the second class, but by a mere internal modification of the roots. We here gladly award to the Sanskṛit family of languages a great superiority over the Semitic, which we do not, however, find in the use of inflexions as syllables *per se* devoid of meaning, but in the copiousness of these grammatical additions, which are really significative, and connected with words used isolated; in the judicious, ingenious selection and application of them, and the accurate and acute defining of various relations, which hereby becomes possible; finally, in the beautiful adjustment of these additions to a harmonious whole, which bears the appearance of an organized body.

109^a. The Indian Grammarians divide the roots according to properties, (which extend only to the tenses which

---

* We find this view of the Chinese admirably elucidated in W. von Humboldt's talented pamphlet, "*Lettre à M. Abel Remusat, sur la nature des formes grammaticales en général, et sur le génie de la langue chinoise.*"

I call the special tenses,* and to the part. pres.,) into ten classes, all of which we have re-discovered in the Zend also, and examples of which are given in the following paragraph.

[G. Ed. p. 114.] We shall here give the characteristics of the Sanskṛit classes, and compare with them those which correspond in the European sister languages.

(1.) The first and sixth class add अ *a* to the root; and we reserve the discussion of the origin of this and other conjugational affixes for the disquisition on the verb. The point of difference between the first class of nearly 1000 roots (almost the half of the entire number) and the sixth class, which contains about 130 roots, lies in this, that the former raise the vowel of the root by Guna (§. 26.), while the latter retain it pure; *e.g.* बोधति *bódhati*, "he knows," from बुध् *budh* (1.); तुदति *tudati*, "he vexes" (comp. *tundit*), from तुद् *tud* (6.) As अ *a* has no Guna,† no discrimination can take place through this vowel between the classes 1. and 6.: but nearly all the roots which belong to either, having अ *a* as the radical vowel, are reckoned in the first class. In Greek, *ε* (before nasals *ο*, §. 3.) corresponds to the affix अ *a*; and *λείπ-ο-μεν,*‡ *φεύγ-ο-μεν,* from ΛΙΠ, ΦΥΓ (*ἔλιπον, ἔφυγον*), belong to the first class, because they have Guna (§. 26.); while, *e.g. θίγ-ο-μεν, θλίβ-ο-μεν,* &c., fall under the sixth class.|| In Latin we recognise, in the third conjugation,

---

* In Greek, the present (indic. imper. and optat., the form of the Greek subjunct. is wanting in Sanskṛit) and imperfect correspond to them; beyond which certain conjugation-signs do not extend. In German, the present of every mood corresponds.

† The accent here distinguishes the 1st cl. from the 6th. *e.g.* for *pátati* did it belong to the 6th. cl., we should have *patáti.*

‡ We give the plural, because the singular, on account of abbreviation, makes the thing less perspicuous.

|| Sanskṛit long vowels admit Guna only when they occur at the end of the root, but in the beginning and middle remain without admixture of the अ *a*; so do short vowels before double consonants.

which I would raise to the first, the cognate of the Sanskṛit first and sixth class, since we regard the addition *i* as a weakening of the old *a* (§. 8.); and *e.g. legimus* has the same relation to *λέγ-ο-μεν*, that the genitive *ped-is* has to *ποδ-ός* where the Sanskṛit has likewise *a* (पदस् [G. Ed. p. 115.] *pad-as*). In *leg-u-nt*, from *leg-a-nti*, the old *a*, through the influence of the liquid, has become *u* (Comp. §. 66.). In German, all the primitive (strong) verbs, with the exception of some remains of the fourth class (No. 2.), stand in clear connection with the Sanskṛit first class, which is here, for the first time, laid down in its full extent.* The अ *a* which is added to the root has, in Gothic†, before some personal terminations, remained unchanged; before others, according to §. 67., and as in Latin, been weakened to *i*; so, *hait-a*, "I am called," *hait-i-s, hait-i-th*, 2d pers. du. *hait-a-ts;* pl. *hait-a-m, hait-i-th, hait-a-nd.* The radical vowels *i* and *u* keep the Guna addition, as in Sanskṛit, only that the *a* which gives the Guna is here weakened to *i* (§. 27.), which, with a radical *i*, is aggregated into a long *i* (written *ei*, §. 70.): hence *keina* (= *kîna*, from *kiina*), "I germinate," from *KIN*; *biuga*, "I bend," from *BUG*, Sanskṛit भुज् *bhuj*, whence भुग्न *bhugna*, "bent." The diphthongs *ai*, *au*, as in Sanskṛit ए and ओ (§. 2.), are incapable of any Guna; as are *ê* (= आ, §. 69.) and *a*. The Sanskṛit radical vowel अ *a* has, however, in Gothic, experienced a threefold destiny. It has either remained unaltered in the special tenses, and is lengthened in the preterite, except in reduplicate roots (*i.e.* to *ô*, see §. 69.)—

---

* I have already, in my Review of Grimm's Grammar, expressed the conjecture that the *a* of forms like *haita, haitam, haitaima*, &c. does not belong to the personal termination, but is identical with the अ *a* of the Sanskṛit 1st and 6th classes; but I was not then clear regarding the Guna in the present in all roots with vowels capable of Guna. (See Ann. Reg. for Crit. of Litt., Book II. pp. 282 and 259.)

† We make frequent mention of the Gothic alone as the true starting-point and light of German Grammar. The application to the High German will hereafter present itself.

thus, *e.g. far-i-th*, "he wanders," answers to चरति *charati* [G. Ed. p. 116.] (§. 14.), and *fôr*, "he wandered," to चचार *chachâra*; or, secondly, the old *a* shews itself in the special tenses weakened to *i*, but retained in the monosyllabic singular of the preterite: so that here the stronger *a* (§. 8.) corresponds to the weaker *i* in the same way that, in the first case, the *ô* (= आ *â*) does to the short *a*. The root अद् *ad*, "to eat," in Gothic, according to §. 87., forms *AT*; hence, in the present, *ita*; in the sing. pret., *at*, *as-t*, *at*. The third fate which befalls the *a* of the root in Gothic is a complete extirpation, and compensation by the weaker *i*, which is treated like an original *i*, existing in the Sanskṛit; *i.e.* in the special tenses it receives Guna by *i*, and in the pret. sing. by *a* (§. 27.), but in the pret. pl. it is preserved pure. To this class belongs the *KIN*, "to germinate," mentioned above, pres. *keina*, pret. sing. *kain*, pl. *kin-um*. The corresponding Sanskṛit root is जन् *jan*, "to produce," "to be born" (see §. 87.): the same relation, too, has *greipa*, *graip*, *gripum*, from *GRIP*, "to seize," to ग्रभ् *grabh* (Vêda form): on the other hand, *BIT*, "to bite,"* (*beita*, *bait*, *bitum*), has an original *i*, which exists in Sanskṛit (comp. भिद् *bhid*, "to cleave"); just so, *VIT*, "to know," Sanskṛit विद् *vid*.

(2.) The fourth class of Sanskṛit roots adds to them the syllable य *ya*, and herein agrees with the special tenses of the passive; and from the roots which belong to it spring chiefly neuter verbs, as *e.g.* नश्यति *naśyati*, "he perishes," Their number amounts altogether to about 130. The German has preserved one unmistakeable remnant of this class, in those strong verbs which again lay aside, in the preterite, the syllable *ỵa* (weakened to *ỵi*), which is added to the root in the [G. Ed. p. 117.] special tenses; *e.g. vahs-ỵa* (Zend 𐬎𐬑𐬱𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬥 *ucs-yaǹn*, "*crescebant*," Vendidâd S. p. 257), "*cresco*," *vahs-ỵi-th*, "*crescit*," pret. *vôhs*.

---

* Occurs only with the prep. *and*, and with the meaning "to scold," but corresponds to the Old High German root *BIZ*, "to bite."

(3.) The second, third, and seventh classes add the personal termination direct to the root; but in the cognate European languages, to facilitate the conjugation, these classes have mainly passed over to the first class; *e. g. ed-i-mus*, not *ed-mus* (as a remnant of the old construction *es-t*, *es-tis*), Gothic *it-a-m*, Old High German *iz-a-mês* not *iz-mês*, answering to the Sanskṛit अद्मस् *ad-mas*. The second class, to which अद् *ad* belongs, leaves the root without any characteristic addition, with Guna of the vowels capable of Guna before light terminations, which must be hereafter explained; hence, *e.g.* एमि *êmi*, corresponding to इमस् *imas*, from इ *i* "to go," as in Greek *εἶμι* to *ἴμεν*. It contains not more than about seventy roots, partly terminating in consonants, partly in vowels. In this and the third-class, the Greek exhibits roots, almost entirely ending in vowels, as the above mentioned 'I, ΦΑ, ΓΝΩ (*γνῶ-θι*), ΔΩ, ΣΤΑ, ΘΗ, ΦΥ (*ἔφυν*), ΔΥ, &c. To the consonants the direct combination with the consonants of the termination has become too heavy, and 'ΕΣ alone (because of the facility of *σμ*, *στ*) has remained in the Sanskṛit second class, as the corresponding root in Latin, Lithuanian, and German. Hence, अस्ति *asti*, *ἐστί*, Lithuan. *esti*, *est*, Gothic and High German *ist*. In the Latin there fall also to the second class, *I*, *DA*, *STA*, *FLA*, *FA*, and *NA*; and also *in-quam*, whence *QUA* weakened to *QUI*, is the root, which, in Gothic, appears as *QUAT*, weakened to *QUIT*, with the accretion of a *T*. *FER* and *VEL* (*VUL*) have preserved some persons of the ancient construction.* [G. Ed. p. 118.] The third class is distinguished from the second by a syllable of reduplication in the special tenses, and has maintained itself under this form in Greek also, and Lithuanian. In

---

* Five roots of the second class introduce in Sanskṛit, between the consonants of the root and the personal termination, an इ *i*, as रोदिमि *rôd-i-mi*, "I weep," from रुद् *rud*. I can, however, no longer believe that the *i* of the Latin third conjug. is connected with this इ *i*, as there is scarce any doubt of its relationship with the अ *a* of the very copious first class.

Sanskṛit it comprehends about twenty roots; *e.g.* ददामि *dadâmi*, *δίδωμι*, Lithuanian *dudu;* दधामि *dadhâmi*, *τίθημι* (§. 16.); जजन्मि *jajanmi*, "I beget," comp. *γί-γν-ο-μαι*. The seventh class, of about twenty-four roots, introduces, in the special tenses, a nasal into the root, which is extended before the light personal terminations to the syllable *na; e.g.* भिनद्मि *bhinadmi*, "I cleave," भिन्द्मस् *bhindmas*, "we cleave." The Latin has kept the weaker form of this nasalization, but has further added to the root the affix of the first class (p. 114 G. Ed.); hence *findo, find-i-mus*. From the Greek come to be here considered roots, like ΜΑΘ, ΛΑΒ, ΘΙΓ, in which the inserted nasal has been repeated further on in the word, with the prefixed *a*, and, like the Latin *find-i-mus*, is connected with the affix of the first class; thus, *μανθ-άν-ο-μεν*, *λαμβ-άν-ο-μεν*, *θιγγ-άν-ο-μεν*.

(4.) The fifth class, of about thirty roots, has *nu*; and the eighth, with ten roots, which, excepting कृ *kṛi*, "to make," all terminate in न् *n* or ण् *ṇ*, has *u* for its characteristic addition: the *u*, however, of these two classes is lengthened before the light terminations by Guna, which in the corresponding Greek appended syllables, *νυ* and *υ*, is supplied by lengthening the *υ*; thus, *e.g.* *δείκνῡμι*, *δείκνῠμεν*, as in Sanskṛit आप्नोमि *âp-nô-mi*, "*ad-ip-is-cor*," आप्नुमस् *âp-nu-mas*, "*adipiscimur*." An example of the eighth class is तन् *tan*, "to extend," whence तनोमि *tan-ô-mi*=*τάν-ῡ-μι*, तनुमस् *tan-u-mas*=*τάν-ῠ-μες*. With the उ *u*, *υ*, of the eighth class, is probably connected [G. Ed. p. 119.] the *v* in some Gothic strong verbs, where, however, it adheres so firmly to the root, that, in a German point of view, it must be regarded as a radical. Hence it is not dropped in the preterite, and receives, in the special tenses, like all strong verbs, the affix of the Sanskṛit first class; *e, g.* *saihva*,* "I see," *sahv*, "I saw."

(5.) The ninth class adds ना *nâ* to the root, which syllable, before heavy terminations, instead of being shortened to न *na*, replaces the heavy आ *â* by the lighter ई *î* (§. 6.), and is thus weakened to नी *nî*. *E.g.* from मृद् *mṛid*, "to crush," (comp. *mordeo*) comes मृद्नामि *mṛidnâmi*, मृद्नीमस् *mṛidnîmas*. In this is easily perceived the relationship with Greek formations in *νημι* (*νᾱμι*) *νᾰμεν*; *e.g.* *δάμνημι*, *δάμναμεν*. As ᾰ, ε, and ο, are originally one, formations like *τέμ-νομεν* belong to this class, only that they have wandered into the more modern ω-conjugation at a remote period of antiquity; for more lately *νεω* would not have become *νω* from *νημι*.

---

* I now consider the *v* of *saihvâ* and similar verbs as purely euphonic, cf. §. 86. and Latin forms like *cogno*, *linquo*, *stinguo*.

(6.) The tenth class adds अय *aya* to the root, but is distinguished from the other classes in this farther important point, that this affix is not limited to the special tenses: the final *a* of अय *aya* is peculiar to them, but अय् *ay* extends, with very few exceptions, to all the other formations of the root. All causals, and many denominatives, follow this class, and, indeed, from every root a causal can be formed by the addition अय् *ay*, which is always accompanied by Guna of the middle vowel of the root capable of Guna, or by Vṛiddhi of every radical final vowel and of a middle *a* belonging to the root; *e.g.* वेदयति *vêd-aya-ti* "he makes to know," from विद् *vid*; श्रावयति *śrâv-aya-ti*, "he makes to hear," from श्रु *śru*. We recognise, in German, the affix अय *aya* at least in two shapes: in the one [G. Ed. p. 120.] the first *a*, in the other the last, is lost, and in the latter case *y* has become *i*; so that I have no longer any scruple in tracing back Grimm's first and third conjugation of the weak form to a common origin. According to all probability, however, the verbs with the affix *ô* also (as Old High German *manôn*, "to mention," "to make to think,") belong to this class, regarding which we will speak further under the verb. The Old High German gives *ê* as the contraction of $a + i$, (see §. 78.), but retains its *ê* more firmly than the Gothic its *ai*, which, in several persons, sinks into a simple *a*. Compare Gothic *haba*, *habam*, *haband*, with Old High German *hapêm*, *hapêmes*, *hapênt*. Very remarkable, however, is the concurrence of the Prâkṛit with the Old High German and the Latin of the 2d conj. in this point, that it in like manner has contracted the affix अय *aya* to ए *ê*. Compare Sanskrit मानयामि *mânayâmi*, "I honour," Prâkṛit माणेमि *mâṇêmi*,* Old High German, *var-manêm*, "I despise," Latin *moneo*:

[G. Ed. p. 121.]

SANSKṚIT.	PRÂKṚIT.	OLD HIGH GERMAN.	LATIN.
मानयामि *mânayâmi*	माणेमि *mâṇêmi*	*var-manêm*	*moneo*
मानयसि *mânayasi*	माणेसि *mâṇêsi*	*manês*	*monês*
मानयति *mânayati*	माणेदि *mâṇêdi*	*manêt*	*monet*
मानयामस् *mânayâmas*	माणेम्ह *mâṇêmha*	*manêmes*	*monêmus*
मानयथ *mânayatha*	माणेध *mâṇêdha*	*manêt*	*monêtis*
मानयन्ति *mânayanti*	माणेन्ति *mâṇênti*	*manênt*	*monent*

In regard to those weak verbs, which have suppressed the first vowel of the Sanskṛit अय *aya*, and give therefore *ya* as affix, we will here further recall attention to the forms *iga* (*ige*), which occasionally occur in Old High German and Anglo Saxon, whose connection with अय *aya* is to be traced thus, that the semi-vowel *y* has become hardened to *g*, (comp. §. 19.), and the preceding *a* weakened to *i*. In Greek, the cognate verbs to the Sanskṛit of the tenth class are to be looked for in those in *αω, εω, οω*; in Latin, besides the 2d conjugation compared above, most verbs of the 1st and 4th also belong to this affinity. We shall recur to them when speaking of the verb.

---

* I am not at present able to adduce this verb from the edited texts: it is, however, certain, that *mânayâmi* in this dialect can have no other sound but *mânêmi*. The conjugation is supported by other examples of this class, as *chintêmi*, "I think" (from *chintayâmi*), *ṇivêdêmi* (from *ṇivê-dayâmi*). In the plural the termination *mha* is nothing else than the appended verb substantive (Sansk. *smas*, "we are"). In the third pers. pl., together with *mânenti* the forms *mânaanti* and *mânanti* are also admissible. The Indian Grammarians assume for the Sanscrit a root *mân*, "to honour": more probably, however, the verb, for which this root is supplied, is only a denominative from *mâna*, "honour"; and this substantive itself a derivation from *man*, "to think," whence *ava-man*, "to despise," as in Old High German *var-MAN* (by Otfrid, *fir-MON*). The root, therefore, which is contained in *varmanêm* is identical with the Gothic *MAN* (*man*, "I mean," "I think," pl. *munum* see §. 66.). To this class belongs, also, the Latin *monere*, as, "to make to think" (Old High German *manôn*), the radical *o* for *a* of which we explain by the principle of §. 66. (see, also, §. 3.); while the *i* of *memin-i* is a weakening of the original *a*, explained by §. 6.

109^b. In order to adduce single examples of the multiform construction of the roots, let us examine the order of the final letters; but we will select only such examples as are common to the Sanskṛit and several sister languages. The greatest forbearance, however, is requisite, as an authenticated comparison of all that admits of comparison would easily swell to a book, which shall hereafter be devoted to this subject.*

(1.) Roots ending with a vowel:— [G. Ed. p. 122.]

"There are, as has been already remarked (§. 105.), no roots in अ *a*; but roots in आ *â* are numerous. Thus गा^{3} *gâ*,† "to go," contained in the Latin *navi-ga-re*; also, perhaps, in *fati-gare*, the first member of which belongs to *fatiscor*, *fessus*; in Greek, *βίβημι* answers to जगामि *jagâmi*, and rests on the frequent interchange of gutturals and labials; Gothic *ga-thvô*, "a street," (see p. 102. G. Ed.); Zend 𐬔𐬁𐬙𐬎 *gâ-tu*, "a place," (nom. 𐬔𐬁𐬙𐬎𐬱 *gâtus*; Old High German *gâ-m*, "I go," = जगामि *ja-gâ-mi*; not therefore, as Grimm conjectures (p. 868), by syncope from *gangu*, but, with a more ancient and regular foundation, only with a suppression of the Sanskṛit syllable of reduplication, introduced, therefore, from the third into the second class (see p. 117. G. Ed.), as in Latin, *da-mus* answering to *δίδο-μεν*. Thus, also, *stâ-m*, *stâ-s*, *stâ-t*, in like manner, with suppressed reduplication, corresponds to *ἵ-στη-μι* (for *σίστημι*), and to the Sanskṛit root स्था *sthâ*, which is irregularly inflected, तिष्ठामि *tishṭhâmi*, तिष्ठसि *tishṭhasi*, तिष्ठति *tishṭhati*, for *tasthâmi*, *tasthâsi*, *tasthâti*, which will be more closely considered hereafter. The Latin, in root and inflexion, most resembles the Old High German: the Zend, however, in its 𐬵𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬁𐬨𐬌 *histâmi** (for *siśtâmi*, see §. 53.), appears in a genuine Greek dress. Observe, also, the 𐬭𐬀𐬚𐬀𐬉𐬱𐬙𐬃 *rathaêśtâo*, "warrior," which occurs so often in the Zend-Avesta, properly "chariot stander," with *o* for *s* as the sign of the nominative. How, then, in Old High German, comes from *STA* the extended form of the root *STANT*, whence the present *stantu*, "I stand," and preterite *stuont*, "I *or* he stood"; for which the Gothic has *standa*, *stôth*? We will here only preliminarily remark, that we have observed in Zend also, in some roots terminating in *â*, an inclination to connect themselves with a *t*-sound. Thus we find, from 𐬱𐬥𐬁 *śnâ*, "to wash," "to purify," (Sansk. स्ना *snâ*, "to bathe,") whence *snâta*, "purified," in Vend. S. p. 233, frequently 𐬟𐬭𐬀𐬱𐬥𐬁𐬜𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬈𐬥 *fra-śnâdhayĕn* "*lavent*"; from 𐬛𐬁 *dâ*, "to lay," (Sans. धा *dhâ*, p. 118 G. Ed.), we find 𐬥𐬌𐬛𐬀𐬌𐬚𐬌𐬌𐬆𐬧 *nidaithyanṅ*, "*deponant*" (as Vendidâd S. pp. 205 and 206, 𐬵𐬎𐬱𐬐𐬉 𐬰𐬆𐬨𐬉 𐬥𐬌𐬛𐬀𐬌𐬚𐬌𐬌𐬆𐬧 *huskê zĕmê nidaithyanṅ*, "*in siccâ terrâ deponant*"): from the same root we find the imperative [G. Ed. p. 123.] form, 𐬥𐬌𐬛𐬁𐬚𐬁𐬨𐬀 *ni-dâ-thâma*, "*deponamus*" (Vend. S. p. 208, 𐬐𐬎𐬀 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬧 𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬆𐬧 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬏𐬨 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬁𐬨𐬀 𐬀𐬵𐬎𐬭𐬀 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬛𐬀 𐬐𐬎𐬀 𐬥𐬌𐬛𐬁𐬚𐬁𐬨𐬀 *kva naranṁ iśritananṁ tanûm barâma Ahura mazda kva nidâthâma*, "*Quo hominum mortuorum corpus feramus, ubi deponamus*"?). Of the Germanic we will further remark, that the root मा *mâ*, "to measure" (cf. *μέ-τρον*), has connected itself with a *t*-sound, and forms, in Gothic, *MAT*, present *mita* (§. 109ᵃ. 1.). ज्ञा *jnâ*, "to be acquainted with," "to know," ΓΝΩ, *GNA* (*gnarus*) Old High German *CHNĀ* (§. 87.); whence *chnâ-ta*, "I knew," annexing the auxiliary verb direct, as in Latin (*g*)*no-vi*. To the special form, जानामि *jânâmi*, for ज्ञानामि *jnâ-nâ-mi*, may belong the Gothic root *KANN*, Old High German *CHANN* (*kann, chan*, "I know," see §. 94., *kunnum, chunnum*, "we know," see §.66.). ध्मा[1] *dhmâ*, "to blow," alters itself in the special forms to धम् *dham*, Latin *FLA*, according to the second class (§. 109ª 3.), Old High German *PLÂ* (§§. 12. 20.), whence *plâ-ta*, "*flavi*." As in Sanskṛit, from the above-mentioned धम् *dham*, comes the nominal base धमनी *dhamanî*, "a vein"; so may the Gothic base *BLOTHA* (nom. acc. *blôth*, "blood") come here also under consideration. We pass on to roots in *i*, and have to remark that the root mentioned at p. 107. G. Ed., इ *i*, "to go," is not unknown in German. We find it in the Gothic imperative *hir-i*, "come here"; du. *hir-ỵats*; pl. *hir-ỵith*. I believe, too, that in the irregular preterite *iddỵa*, "I went," the *i* alone can be assumed as the root. In Zend occurs 𐬀𐬉𐬌𐬙𐬌 *aêi-ti*, "he goes" (from एति *êti*, according to §§. 28. 41.), Lithuan. *ei-ti*. श्रि[5] *śri*, "to go," with the prep. उत् *ut*, "to raise itself"; hence, उच्छ्रित *uchchhrita*, "raised," "high"; compare *cre-sco, cre-vi* (see §. 21.), Old High German *SCRIT*, "to step," with the addition of a *t*, as in the case of *mat*, from मा *mâ*: perhaps the Latin *gradior*, as well as *cresco*, might be here included, the Guna form of the vowel, as in श्रयति *śray-a-ti*, "he goes," being observed. स्मि *smi*, "to smile," Old High German *SMIL*; प्री[9] *prî*, "to love," Zend 𐬟𐬭𐬍 *frî* (§. 47.), Goth. *friỵô*, "I love" (§. 87.), compare प्रिय *priya*, "dear." भी[3] *bhî*, "to fear," बिभेमि *bibhê-mi*. "I fear"; Lithuan. *biyau*; Gothic *fiỵa*, "I hate" (*fiỵais, fiỵaith*), *fiỵands*, "foe"; Old High German *viêm* or *fiêm*, "I hate": the Greek *φέβ-ο-μαι* answers to the Sanskṛit reduplication of *bibhêmi*; so that, contrary to the common rule, the aspirates have remained in the prefix, but in the base itself have become medials, and this has left only *β* as the whole root, as in Sanskṛit *da-d-mas*, "we give," for *da-dâ-mas*, *δί-δο-μες*. Perhaps, also, [G. Ed. p. 124.] ΦΙΔ, *φείδομαι*, is to be referred to the roots in *i*, so that an unorganic dental affix would be to be assumed. शी^{2} *śí*, "to lie," "to sleep," with irregular Guna in the middle; hence *śê-tê* = *κεῖ-ται*. ह्री^{3} *hrí*, "to be ashamed"; Old High German *HRU*, "to repent" (*hriw-u*, *hrou*, *hru-umês*, see p. 115. G. Ed.). Of roots in *u*, द्रु^{1} *dru*, "to run," द्रवति *drav-a-ti*, "he runs" may furnish, through the Guna form, the Greek *δρά-σκω*, *δι-δρά-σκω*, which appears hence to derive its *α* with suppression of the digamma: the *μ* of *δρέμω*, however, might pass as a hardening of the व् *v* (§. 63.), and *δρέμ-ο-μεν*, *δρέμ-ε-τε*, &c., therefore represent most truly the forms *drav-â-mas*, *drav-a-tha*. प्लु^{1} *plu*, "to go," "to swim," "to float" (प्लव *plava*, "a ship"), Latin *FLU*. The Greek *πλέω*, *πλόω* is again not to be so regarded as if the old *u* had been corrupted to *ε* or *ο*, but *πλέ(Ϝ)ω*, *πλο(Ϝ)ω* supply the place of the Guna form in *plav-ê* (of the middle voice), 3d pers. *plav-a-tê*: the future *πλεύσω*, the *υ* having the Guna (§. 26.), answers to प्लोष्ये *plô-ṣhyê*; Lithuan. *plaukiu*, "I swim," with a guttural added, as in Latin *fluc-si* from *fluv* (p. 98. G. Ed.). Old High German *VLUZ*, "to flow," pre-supposes the Gothic *FLUT* (§. 87.); with the favourite dental addition, with which all final vowels are so commonly invested. श्रु^{5} *śru*, "to hear," ΚΛΥ (§§. 20., 21.), Gothic *HLIU-MAN* (nominative *hliuma*), "ear," as "hearer," with weakened Guna (§. 27.); with regard to the *kl* for *śr*, compare, also, *clunis* with श्रोणी *śrônî*, *f.* "hip.") Lithuan. *klausau*, "I hear." Perhaps *erudio*, as "to make hear," is to be referred to this class: the derivation from *e* and *rudis* is little satisfactory. Anquetil introduces a Zend *erodé*, *célebre*, (*κλυτός*), which I have not yet found in the original text, but I meet with the causal form 𐬯𐬭𐬁𐬎𐬀𐬫𐬉𐬨𐬌 *śrâvayêmi* (Sansk. श्रावयामि *śrâvayâmi*), "I speak," "recite" (V. S. p. 38). The Old High German, *scrirumês*, "we have exclaimed," gives *SCRIR* as the root, and rests probably on the form *śrâv* (§. 20.), with a thinning of the *â* to *i* (§. 66.); the present and sing. preterite, however, have lost the *r* (*scriu* for *scriru*, *screi* for *screir*), like the Greek *κλή-σω*, *κέκλη-κα*, &c. The Latin *clamo*, however, has the same relation to श्राव् *śrâv* that *mare* has to वारि *vâri*, "water" (§. 63.), and *δρεμ* to द्रव् *drav*, from द्रु *dru*, "to run." 𐬵𐬎 *hu*^{5}, "to extol," "to glorify" (𐬵𐬎𐬥𐬏𐬙𐬀 *hunûta*, "he celebrated," V. S. p. 39.), is probably the root of the Greek *ὕμνος* (*ὕμ(ε)νος*), which I do not like to regard as an irregular derivative from *ὕδω*. पू *pû*$^{1. 9.}$ "to purify," *PUrus*. This root is the verbal parent of the wind and fire, which are both represented as pure. पवन *pavana* (with Guna and *ana* [G. Ed. p. 125.] as suffix) is "the wind," and the corresponding Gothic *FŌNA* (neut. nom. acc. *fôn*, see §. 116.) is "fire," which in Sanskṛit is called पावक *pâv-a-ka*, with Vṛiddhi and *aka* as suffix. The relation of *FŌNA* to पवन *pavana* resembles that of the Latin *mâlo* from *mavolo*; the loss of the syllable व *va* is replaced by the lengthening of the *a* (§. 69.). The Greek *πῦρ* and Old High German *VIURA* (nom. acc. *viur*), the latter with weakened Guna (§. 27.), and *ra* as suffix, both fall to the root, पू *pû*. ब्रू^{2} *brû*, "to speak," Zend 𐬨𐬭𐬏 *mrû* (*e.g.* 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬨 *mraô-m*, "I spoke," V. S. p. 123.); the Greek *ῥέ(Ϝ)ω* rests on the Guna form ब्रवीमि *brav-î-mi*, and has, as often happens, lost the former of two initial consonants (cf. also *ῥέω*, *ῥεύω*, and *ruo*, with स्रु *sru*, "to flow"). The Old High German *SPRAH*, or *SPRAHH* (*sprihhu*, "I speak," *sprah*, "I spoke") appears to have proceeded from ब्रव् *brav*, by hardening the व् *v* (see §. 19.), and prefixing an *s* akin to the *p*. भू *bhû*, "to be," Zend 𐬠𐬏 *bû*, Lithuan. *BU* (future *bûsu*, "I will be"), Latin *FU*, Greek ΦΥ. Probably, also, BY, in *πρέσ-βυ-ς*, *πρεσβύτης*, &c., is only another form of this root (cf. §. 18.); so that *πρές* would have to be regarded as a preposition from *πρό* (प्र *pra*,) essentially distinguished only by a euphonic Σ (cf. §. 96.). Moreover, the base *πρέσβυ* has a striking resemblance to प्रभु *prabhu* (*excelsus, augustus*), literally, "being before." In Old High German *pim* or *bim* corresponds to the

---

* Somewhat that pertains to this subject I have already put together very concisely at the end of my Sanscrit Glossary.

† The attached cyphers denote the classes described in §. 109^a.

---

* I believe I may deduce this form from the 3d pers. pl. 𐬵𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬌 *histĕnti* (cf. *ἵσταντι*) in the V. S. p. 183: more on this head under the verb.

Sanskṛit भवामि *bhavâmi:* more exact, however, is the correspondence in the plural of *pir-u-mês, pir-u-t,* to *bhav-â-mas,* "*sumus,*" *bhav-a-tha,* "*estis*" (see §. 19.). To this class belongs, also, *PŪ,* "to dwell" (*pû-ta,* "I dwelt"), as the Sanskṛit वस *vas* "to dwell," in German *VAS, WAS,* has become *seyn.* In Sanskṛit, too, from भू *bhû,* "to be," comes the substantive *bhav-ana* "house," as place of being. The Gothic *baua,* "I build," may be regarded as the causal of the idea "to be," like the Latin *facio* (§. 19.): its conjugation answers also to भावयामि *bhâvayâmi,* "I make to be," which, in Prâkṛit, may sound *bhâvêmi, bhâvêsi, bhâvêti* (Gothic *baua, bauais, bauait*). See p. 121 G. Ed. Sanskṛit roots ending in diphthongs (ए *ê,* ओ *ô,* ऐ *âi*; there are no roots in औ *âu*) follow in their formations, in many respects, the analogy of roots in आ *â.* We abstain from adducing examples of them, as they also offer little occasion for comparison.

(2.) Roots terminating with a consonant. We shall give [G. Ed. p. 126.] only a few examples, in which we compare roots with the same vowel, and proceed in the order, *a, i, u.* According to §. 1. we do not allow the vowel ऋ *ṛi* and ॠ *ṛî* to belong to the root. Long radical vowels before a final consonant are rare; and the majority of them are probably not original.

The most numerous class of roots ending with a consonant has a medial अ *a.* So वच्[1.2] *vach,* Zend 𐬬𐬀𐬗 *vach* (𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬙𐬀 *aôcta,* "*dixit,*" Vend. S. p. 124), Greek ΕΠ for ϜΕΠ (§. 14.), Latin *VOC,* Old High German, *WAH, WAG* (*ki-wahu,* "*mentionem facio,*" pret. *ki-wuoh* pl. *ki·wuogumês*). प्रछ्[6] *prachh,* Zend 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬯 *pĕrĕs,* Gothic *FRAH*; pres पृच्छामि *pṛichchhâmi,* 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬯𐬁𐬨𐬌 *pĕrĕsâmi, fraiha* for *friha* (see §. 82. and §. 109ª. 1.); the Latin *ROG* (*rogo, interrogo*) appears to be abbreviated from *FROG.* पत्[1] *pat,* "to fall," "to fly," Zend 𐬞𐬀𐬙 *pat,* "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. 𐬫𐬀𐬝 𐬟𐬭𐬁 𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬋 𐬞𐬀𐬙𐬄𐬥 𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬀 𐬎𐬑𐬱𐬌𐬌𐬄𐬥 *yaṭ frâ vayô patann urvara ucsyann,* "where birds fly, trees grow"). One sees clearly from this that, in Greek, *πίπτω, πετάω, πετάομαι, πέτομαι, πτῆμι,* &c. belong to a common root ΠΕΤ; Latin *PET, peto, im-peto, præpetes, penna* by assimilation for *pet-na.* In Gothic *FATH,* or, with the vowel weakened, *FITH,* might be looked for. To the latter corresponds, according to §. 87., Old High German *VËD,* in *vëd-ara,* "feather," वद्$^{1.10.}$ *vad,* "to speak," Latin *VAD,* contained in *vas, vad-is.* From वद् *vad* proceeds the abbreviated form उद् *ud,* to which pertains ʽΥΔ (ὕδω, ὑδέω, ὕδης). The Old High German gives *WAZ* (*var-wâzu* "*maledico*"), with *z* for *d,* according to §. 87., and the vowel of the base lengthened, as in वादयामि *vâdayâmi,* according to the tenth class. सद्^{6} *sad,* "to sink, with the prep. नि *ni,* "to set oneself down"; Latin *SED, SID, sido, sedeo;* Greek ʽΕΔ, ʽΙΖ, ἕδος, ἕδρα, ἵζομαι; Gothic *SAT* (§. 87.), *sita,* "I sit" (p. 116 G. Ed.). अन्^{2} *an,* "to blow," "to breathe," अनिल *anila,* "wind," Gothic *AN, usana,* "I expire," cf. ἄνεμος, "*animus.*" जन्^{3} *jan,* "to beget," Zend 𐬰𐬀𐬥 *zan* (§. 58.), 𐬰𐬀𐬰𐬁𐬨𐬌 *zazâmi,* "I beget," Sanskṛit जजन्मि *jajanmi,* Greek ΓΕΝ, Latin *GEN* (*γίγνομαι, γένος, gigno, genus*), Gothic *KIN,* "to germinate," (p. 116 G. Ed.); *kuni,* "gender" (§. 66.). कर्^{8} *kar* (कृ *kṛi*), *e.g.* करोति *karôti,* "*facit*": this root, in Zend, follows the fifth class; *e.g.* 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬀𐬊𐬌𐬙𐬌 *kĕrĕnaôiti* (§. 41.), "*facit,*" 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬀𐬊𐬝 *kĕrĕnaôṭ,* "*fecit,*" 𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬎𐬌𐬜𐬌 *kĕrĕnûidhi,* "*fac*"; Old High German *karawan* or *garawan,* "to prepare"; Latin *creo, cura* (cf. कुरु *kuru,* "*fac*"), *ceremonia,* and with *p* for *c* (§. 14.), *paro;* Greek *κραίνω, κρά-τος;* with *π, πράσσω, πρακ-σω,* [G. Ed. p. 127.] *πρᾶγ-μα,* where the guttural appears to be a hardening of the व् *v* (§. 19.), *e.g.* of कुर्वन्ति *kurvanti,* "*faciunt*" (from *kur-u--anti*). वह्^{1} *vah,* "to drive," "to carry," Zend 𐬬𐬀𐬰 *vaz* (§. 57.), Latin *VEH,* Greek ὄχος, "wagon," as bearer, carrier, for Ϝόχος. श्वस्^{2} *śvas,* "to breathe," cf. *spiro,* according to §§. 50. and 22. ग्रह्$^{9.10.}$ *grah,* "to take": the original form, occurring in the Vedas, is ग्रभ् *grabh.* To this the Zend form belongs, according to the tenth class, and, indeed, so that the भ् *bh* appears before vowels as 𐬬 *v*, but before 𐬙 *t* as 𐬞 *p*. Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 155: [illegible] *ashâum; yêzi nôiṭ uzvarĕzyâṭ yô narĕm âgĕrĕptĕm âgeurvayêitê, kâ hê asti chitha?* "*Pure! si non dimittit, qui hominem captum capit* (i. e. *tenet*), *quænam ei est pœna*"?* In the European sister languages I believe I recognise this root in three forms: the Gothic *GRIP* has been already mentioned (p. 116 G. Ed.), likewise *prehendo* (§. 92. note): by changing the medials into their tenues, ΚΛΕΠ also seems to belong to this class, Gothic *HLIF*, "to steal," *hliftus*, "thief." Finally, also, in Greek, γρῖπος, γρῖφος, "the net," stands quite isolated, and appears to me to be related to the Indian ग्रभ् *grabh*, by changing the *a* into *i*. आस्² *âs*, "to sit," Greek ʽΗΣ a remnant of the second class, terminating in a consonant to be supplied at §. 109ª. 3.; ἧσ-ται answers exactly to आस्ते *âs-tê* (middle voice), and hence ἧμαι stands for ἧσμαι, as εἰμί for ἐσμί (Sanskrit *asmi*). भ्राज्¹ *bhrâj*, "to shine," Zend 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰 *bĕrĕz* (§. 58). or† 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬰 *barĕz*, whence the part. pres. 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬙 *bĕrĕzant*, nom. m. 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬀𐬣𐬯 *bĕrĕzañs*, "*splendens*," "*altus*," very frequently occurs. This Zend form prepares the way for the Old High German root *PERAH*, whence *PERAH-TA*‡, nom. *perah-t*, "*fulgidus*." To this root belongs, also, our *Pracht*. The Greek language gives ΦΛΕΓ (§. 20.) a cognate root, and thus [G. Ed. p. 128.] points to a Sanskrit short *a* for the long one. The cognate root in Latin is *FLAG*, *flagro*. छिद्⁷ *chhid*, "to cleave," *SCID*, *scind-i-mus*=*chhindmas* (§. 14.): ΣΧΙΖ, perhaps also ΣΚΙΔ, σκίδνημι, &c. belong to this place; the form is more genuine, and the ideas, too, of clearing, dispersing, separating, are kindred ones. The Gothic *SKAID*, "to separate," if the relationship is certain, has a stiffened Guna, so that *ai* appears to belong to the root. According to §. 87., however, the Gothic form should be *SKAIT* and the Old High German *SKEIZ* for *SKEID*. विद्^{2} *vid*, "to know," Zend 𐬬𐬍𐬛 *vîd*, 'IΔ; Gothic *VID*, Old High German, *VIZ*; in the Latin *VID*, and in εἴδω, "I see," the seeing is regarded as something, which "makes to know," and the conjugation of *video* is causal, according to p. 121 G. Ed. Thus, also, another root, signifying "to know," namely बुध् *budh*, has, in Zend, gained the meaning "to see."* According to the tenth class, and with the prep. *ni*, *VID*, in Zend, signifies "to summon" (𐬥𐬌𐬬𐬀𐬉𐬜𐬀𐬫𐬉𐬨𐬌 *nivaêdhayêmi*, "*invoco*," see §. 28.) In Gothic, *VIT* receives through the prep. *in* the meaning "to adore" (*inveita*, *invait*, *invitum*). दिश्^{6} *diś*, "to shew," Zend 𐬛𐬌𐬱 *diś*^{10}; hence 𐬟𐬭𐬀𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬱𐬀𐬫𐬋 *fradaêśayô*, "thou shewest" (Vend. S. p. 123), Greek ΔΙΚ, with Guna δείκνυμι, according to the fifth class; Latin *DIC*, in *dico*, as it were, "to point out," and *dicis* (*dicis causa*). In Gothic, the rule laid down in §. 87. requires the form *TIH*, and this root, combined with *ga*, signifies "to announce" (*ga-teiha*, *ga-taih*, *ga-taihum*, for *ga-tihum*, according to §. 82.). On the other hand, in *taikus*, "sign," the law for the transposition of letters is violated. जीव्^{1} *jîv*, "life;" Lithuanian *gywa-s*, "alive," *gywenú* "I live," *gywata* "life;" Gothic *QUIVA*, nom. *quivs*, "alive"; Latin *VIV*, as it appears from *QUIV*, as *bis* from *duis* (Sansk. द्विस् *dwis*), *viginti* from *tviginti*. The Zend has dropped either the vowel or the *v* of this root. Hence, *e.g.* 𐬘𐬬𐬀 *jva*, nom. 𐬘𐬬𐬋 *jvô*, "living," (V. S. p. 189); and 𐬵𐬎𐬘𐬍𐬙𐬀𐬫𐬋 *hu-jîtayô*, "*bonam vitam habentes*" (l. c. p. 222), from 𐬵𐬎𐬘𐬍𐬙𐬌 *hu-jîti*. From *jî*, the root, would become, with Guna, *jayâmi*, on which rests the Greek ζάω, the *j* having fallen out (§. 14.); but *βίος* also belongs to this root, and finds a medium of comparison with जीव् *jîv*, in the Latin *vivo*. Of roots with *u*, रुच्^{1} *ruch*, "to shine," and रुद्^{2} *rud*, "to weep," may serve as examples; the former, in Zend, is 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗 *raôch*, (§§. 28. 32.), and follows the tenth class, *e.g.* 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬀𐬫𐬈𐬌𐬙𐬌 [G. Ed. p. 129.] *raochayêiti*, "*splendet.*" In Latin correspond *LUC*, *luc-s*, *luceo* (§. 20.) and *RUD*: the Greek has, in both roots, replaced the *r* by *l*, and presents, for comparison, ΛΥΚ (ἀμφιλύκη, λυκόφως) and ΛΥΖ; to the former, λύχνος, λυχνέυω, &c., has the same relation that, in Zend, 𐬙𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬎𐬱 *tafnu-s*, "burning," has to the root 𐬙𐬀𐬞 *tap* (§. 40.) We must assign λευκός also, with Guna, to the root ΛΥΚ. The Gothic gives *LUH* for *LUK*, according to §. 87.; whence, with the original, or with weakened Guna (§§. 26., 27.), spring forms like *lauhmôni*, "lightning," *lauhatỵan*, "to lighten," *liuhath*, "light." Without Guna, and preserving the old smooth letter, stands *lukarn* (theme, *lukarna*, neut.), "lamp," rather isolated. A root corresponding to रुद् *rud* is wanting in Gothic, but the Old High German has for it, quite regularly according to §. 87., *RUZ*, "to weep" (*riuzu*, *rôz* for *rauz*, according to §. 80., *ruzumês*). भूष्^{1} *bhûṣh*, "to adorn," is perhaps contained in the Latin *or-no*, with loss of the initial letter, as *amo* in relation to कामयामि *kâmayâmi*, "I love." With regard to the *r* for ष् *ṣh*, advert to the relation of *uro* to उष् *uṣh*, "to burn," सेव्^{1} *sev*, "to honour," मेध् *mêdh*, "to think"(?). The latter cannot hitherto be quoted as a verb: it springs, however, from मेधस् *mêdhas* and मेधा *mêdhâ*, "understanding," unless it should be preferred to assume for these words a root *midh*, which, however, the Grammarians do not exhibit. The Gothic has, for comparison, *MIT*, whence *mitô*, "I think": the Greek furnishes an analogous word to *sêv*, viz. ΣΕΒ, σέβω. (§. 4.)

---

* Anquetil translates, "*Si celui qui a commis l'Aguerefté ne reconnoit pas sa faute quelle sera sa punition.*"

† Cf. p. 1281. Note *

‡ The *h* (in the sense of *ch*) corresponding to the *j*, γ, accords with §. 87., but is moreover favoured by the following *t*.

---

* Vide Gram. Crit. p. 328.

110. From the monosyllabic roots proceed nouns, substantive and adjective, by the annexation of syllables,

which we should not, without examination, regard as not, *per se*, significative and, as it were, supernatural mystic beings; to a passive belief in whose undiscoverable nature we are not willing to surrender ourselves. It is more natural to suppose that they have or had meaning, and that the organism of language connects that which has a meaning with what is likewise significative. Why should not language denote accessory ideas, by accessory words appended to the root? Language, which possesses both sense and body, infuses sense and imparts form to every word. The object of nouns is to represent [G. Ed. p. 130.] persons or things, to which that which the abstract root expresses adheres; and hence it is most natural to look for pronouns in the elements used in the formation of words, as the bearers of qualities, actions, and conditions, which the root expresses *in abstracto*. There appears, too, in reality, as we shall develope in the chapter on the pronouns, a complete* identity between the most important elements in the formation of words and some pronominal bases which are declined even in an isolated state. But it is not surprising that several of the elements of verbal formation, in the class of independent words, should not admit of more certain explanation; for these affixes have their origin in the most obscure and early epoch of language, and subsequently they have themselves lost all consciousness as to whence they have been taken, on which account the appended suffix does not always keep equal pace with the alterations which, in the course of time, occur in the corresponding isolated word; or it has been altered while the other remains unchanged. Still, in individual cases, we may remark the admirable exactitude with which the appended grammatical syllables have maintained themselves through thousands of years in an unaltered form; I say, we may remark this from the perfect accordance which exists between various individuals of the Sanskṛit family of languages, although these languages have been removed, as it were, from each other's eyes since time immemorial, and every sister dialect has, since that removal, been left to its own fate and experience.

---

* I direct attention preliminarily to my treatise "On the Influence of Pronouns in the Formation of Words" (Berlin, by F. Dümmler).

111. There are also pure radical words, *i.e.* those of which the theme, without suffix of derivation or personality, repre- G. Ed. p. 131.] sents the naked root, which are then united in declension with the syllables which denote the relations of case. Except at the end of compounds, such radical words are, in Sanskṛit, few in number, and are all feminine abstracts; as, भी *bhî*, "fear," युध् *yudh*, "contest," मुद् *mud*, "joy." In Greek and Latin the pure root is the most rare form of the word; but it does not always appear as an abstract substantive. As, for instance, *e.g.* φλογ (φλόκ-ς), ὀπ (ὄπ-ς). *νιφ* (*νίπ-ς*), *leg* (*lec-s*), *pac* (*pac-s*), *duc* (*duc-s*), *pel-lic* (*pel-lec-s*). In German, commencing even with the Gothic, no pure radical words exist, although, by reason of the abbreviation of the base of the word in the singular, many words have assumed that appearance; for from the abbreviation of these verbal bases, which has been constantly extending during the lapse of time, it is precisely the most modern dialects which appear to exhibit the greatest number of naked roots as nouns. (cf. §. 116.) Naked roots seem most generally used at the end of compounds, on account of the clogging of the preceding part of the word. According to this principle, in Sanskṛit, every root can, in this position, designate the agent by itself; as, *e.g.* धर्मविद् *dharma-vid*, "duty-knowing." In Latin, the use of these compounds is as frequent as in Sanskṛit, only that, according to §. 6., a radical *a* is weakened to *i* or *e*; thus, *carni-fic* (*fec-s*), *tubi-cin* (*cen*). An example in Greek is χερνιβ (for *-νιπ* from *νιπ-τω*). Sanskṛit roots which end with short vowels,

as जि *ji*, "to conquer," are, in compounds of this kind, supported by the addition of a *t*, which so much the more appears to be a simple phonetic affix without signification, that these weakly-constructed roots appear to support themselves on an auxiliary *t* before the gerundial suffix *ya* also. Thus, *e.g.* स्वर्गजित् *svarga-jit*, "conquering the heaven," विजित्य *vi-jit-ya*, "by conquering." In Latin I find [G. Ed. p. 132.] interesting analogies to these formations in *IT* and *STIT*, from the roots *I* and *STA*, the latter weakened to *STI* according to §. 6. Thus, *com-it* (*com-es*), "goer with"; *equ-it* (*equ-es*), "goer on horseback"; *al-it* (*al-es*), "goer with wings"; *super-stit* (*-stes*), "standing by." The German has in this way supported throughout with a *t* several roots terminating with a vowel, and hence given to this letter the character of radicalism, as above mentioned (p. 123 G. Ed.) in *MAT*, from मा *má*, "to measure."

◆

FORMATION OF CASES.

112. The Indian Grammarians take up the declinable word in its primary form, *i.e.* in its state when destitute of all case-termination; and this bare form of the word is given also in dictionaries. In this we follow their example; and where we give Sanscrit and Zend nouns, they stand, unless it is otherwise specified, or the sign of case is separated from the base, in their primary form. The Indian Grammarians, however, did not arrive at their primary forms by the method of independent analysis, as it were by an anatomical dissection or chemical decomposition of the body of language; but were guided by the practical use of the language itself, which, at the beginning of compounds—and the art of composition is, in Sanscrit, just as necessary as that of conjugation or declension—requires the pure primary form; naturally with reservation of the slight changes of the adjoining limits of sound, rendered necessary at times by the laws of euphony. As the primary form at the beginning of compounds can represent every relation of case, it is, as it were, the case general, or the most general of cases, which, in the unlimited use of compounds, occurs more frequently than any other. Nevertheless, the Sanskṛit language does not everywhere remain true to the strict and logical principle usually [G. Ed. p. 134.] followed in composition; and as if to vex the Grammarians, and put their logic to the test, it places as the first member of the compounds in the pronouns of the first and second person the ablative plural, and in those of the third person the nom. and acc. sing. of the neuter, instead of the true primary form. The Indian Grammarians, then, in

this point, have applied to the cases furnished to them by the language, and take the augmented अस्मत् *asmat* or अस्मद् *asmad,* "from us," युष्मत् *yuṣhmat* or युष्मद् *yuṣhmad,* "from you," as the starting-point in the declension, or as the primary form, although in both pronominal forms only अ *a* and यु *yu* belong to the base, which, however, does not extend to the singular. That, however, in spite of this error, the Indian Grammarians understand how to decline the pronouns, and that they are not deficient in external rules for this purpose, is a matter of course. That the interrogative, in its declension, resembles bases in *a*, cannot escape any one who holds the neuter किम् *kim* for the original indeclinable form of the word. Pânini settles the matter here with a very laconic rule, when he says (edit. Calc, p. 969) किमः कः *kimaḣ kaḣ,* i. e, *ka** is substituted for *kim.* If this strange method were to be followed in Latin, and the neuter *quid* in like manner regarded as the theme, then, in order to get at the dative *cu-i* (after the analogy of *fructui*), one would have to say "*quidis cus,*" or "*quidi cus.*" In another place (p. 825), Pânini forms from *idam,* "this" (which in like manner has the honour of passing for a base) and *kim,* "what?" a copulative compound; and by इदङ्किमोर् ईश्की *idankimôr íśkî,* the Grammarian teaches that the putative bases in [G. Ed. p. 135.] the formations under discussion substitute for themselves the forms *î* and *kî.*

113. The Sanskṛit, and the languages akin to it, which in this respect have still kept upon the old footing, distinguish, besides the two natural genders, another—the neuter, which the Indian Grammarians call Klîva, *i. e.* eunuch; which appears to be a peculiarity of the San-

---

* He forms, namely, from *kim,* regarded as a base, *kim-as,* which in reality does not occur, and which has, for the sake of euphony, here become *kimah.*

skṛit, or most perfect family of languages. According to its original intention this gender had to represent inanimate nature, but it has not everywhere confined itself to these old limits: the language imparts life to what is inanimate, and, on the other hand, (according to the view then taken,) impairs the personality of what is by nature animate. The feminine in Sanskṛit, both in the base and in the case-terminations, loves a luxurious fullness of form; and where it is distinguished from the other genders in the base or in the termination, it marks this distinction by broader, and more sonant vowels. The neuter, on the other hand, prefers the greatest conciseness, but distinguishes itself from the masculine, not in the base, but only, in the most conspicuous cases, in the nominative and its perfect counterpart the accusative; in the vocative also, when this is the same as the nominative.

114. Number, in Sanskṛit and its sister languages, is distinguished, not by a particular affix denoting the number, but by the selection or modification of the case-syllable, so that, with the case-suffix, the number is at once known; *e. g. bhyam, bhyâm,* and *bhyas* are cognate syllables, and, among other relations, express that of the dative; the first in the singular (only in the pronoun of the 2d person, तुभ्यं *tubhyam,* "to thee"), the second in the dual, the third in the plural. The dual, like the neuter, in course of time is the first to be lost with the weakening of the vitality [G. Ed. p. 136.] of the view taken by the senses, or is more and more straitened in its use, and then replaced by the abstract plural expressive of infinite number. The Sanskṛit possesses the dual most fully, both in the noun and in the verb, and employs it everywhere where its use could be expected. In the Zend, which otherwise approximates so closely to the Sanskṛit, it is found very rarely in the verb, more frequently in the noun. The Pali has only as much left of it as the Latin, viz. a remnant of it in two words, which signify "two"

and "both"; in the Prâkṛit it is entirely wanting. Of the German languages, only the eldest dialect, the Gothic, possesses it, but merely in the verb; while, on the contrary, in the Hebrew (speaking here of the Semitic languages) it is retained only in the noun, in disadvantageous contrast with the Arabic, which, in many other respects also, is a more perfect language, and which maintains the dual in equal fulness in the verb also; while in the Syriac it has been almost entirely lost in the noun as well as in the verb.*

115. The case-terminations express the reciprocal relations of nouns, *i.e.* the relations of the persons spoken of, to one another, which principally and originally referred only to space, but from space were extended also to time and cause. According to their origin, they are, at least for the most part, pronouns, as will be more clearly developed hereafter. Whence could the exponents of the relations of space, which have grown up with the primary words into a whole, have better been taken, than from those words which express personality, with their inherent secondary idea of room, of that which is nearer or more distant, of that which is on this or that side? [G. Ed. p. 137.] As also in verbs the personal terminations, *i.e.* the pronominal suffixes—although, in the course of time, they are no longer recognised and felt to be that which, by their demonstrable origin, they imply and are—are replaced, or, if we may use the expression, commented on by the isolated pronouns prefixed to the verb; so, in the more sunken, insensible state of the language, the spiritually dead case-terminations are, in their signification of space, replaced, supported, or ex-

---

* Regarding the character, the natural foundation, and the finer gradations in the use of the dual, and its diffusion into the different provinces of language, we possess a talented inquiry, by W. von Humboldt, in the Transactions of the Academy for the year 1827; and some which have been published by Dümmler.

plained by prepositions, and in their personal signification by the article.

116. Before we describe the formation of cases in the order in which the Sanskṛit Grammarians dispose them, it appears desirable to give the different final sounds of the nominal bases with which the case-suffixes unite themselves, as well as to point out the mode in which the cognate languages are in this respect related to one another. The three primary vowels (*a*, *i*, *u*) occur in Sanskṛit, both short and long, at the end of nominal bases; thus, अ *a*, इ *i*, उ *u*; आ *â*, ई *î*, ऊ *û*. To the short *a*, always masculine or neuter, never feminine, *a*, corresponds in Zend and Lithuanian, and also in German, where, however, even in the Gothic (in Grimm's first strong declension), especially in substantives, it is only sparingly retained: in more modern dialects it is commonly supplanted by a more recent *u* or *e*. In Greek, the corresponding termination is the *ο* of the second declension (*e.g.* in λόγο-ς): and *ο* was also the termination of the Latin noun in ancient times; but in the classic period, although sometimes retained, it was commonly changed to *u* in the nom. and accus. sing. (of the second declension). An old *a*, however, is still left in *cola*, *gena*, *cida*, at the end of compounds, where, however, from the want of other analogies, it is used in declension similarly to the feminine [G. Ed. p. 138.] originally long *a*, on which account the nominative is written, not *colas*, *genas*, *cidas*, but *cola*, &c. The Grecian masculines of the first declension in ᾰ-ς,* with the η-ς which has proceeded therefrom, must likewise, according to their origin, be compared with the Sanskṛit masculine short *a*, to which, in regard of quality and preservation of the nominative sign, they have remained faithful, while the *ο* of the second declension has preserved its old original brevity. Their identity with bases in *ο* is excellently shewn by the genitive in *ου*, which does not at all

---

* Cf. p. 1294. l. 20. G. Ed.

suit a theme in *α* or *η*; and further, from such compounds as *μυροπώλη-ς*, *παιδοτρίβη-ς*, in which the vowel that has been added to the roots ΠΩΛ and ΤΡΙΒ supplies the place of the Sanskṛit *a* in similar compounds for which, in Greek, *o* usually stands.

117. To the short *i*, which occurs in the three genders, the same vowel corresponds in the cognate languages. In German it is to be looked for in Grimm's fourth strong declension, which I shall make the second; where, however, from the destructive alterations of time, it becomes nearly as hard as the *a* of the first declension. In Latin, *i* is interchanged with *e*; hence *facile* for *facili*, *mare* for *mari*, Sanskṛit वारि *vâri*, "water." In Greek, before vowels the *ι* is generally weakened to the unorganic *ε*. The short *u* also shews itself in Sanskṛit in the three genders, as in Greek *υ*, and *u* in Gothic, where it distinguishes itself from the *a* and *i* in that it is retained as well before the *s* of the nominative as in the uninflected accusative. In Latin the corresponding letter is the *u* of the fourth declension.

118. The long vowels (*â*, *î*, *û*) belong, in Sanskṛit, principally to the feminine (see §. 113.), are never found in the neuter, and occur in the masculine very rarely. In Zend the long final *a* has generally been shortened in polysyllabic words; as it has in Gothic, in which bases [G. Ed. p. 139.] in *ô* correspond (§. 69.) to the Sanskṛit feminine bases in *â*, and the *ô* in the uninflected nom. and accus. sing. is shortened to *a*, with the exception of the monosyllabic forms *sô*, "she," "this," Sanskṛit सा *sâ*, Zend *hâ*; *hvô*, "which?" Sanskṛit and Zend *kâ*. The Latin, also, in the uninflected nom. and voc., has shortened the old feminine long *a*; but the Lithuanian has, in the nom., maintained the original length. In Greek, the Doric *ᾱ* approaches most nearly to the Sanskṛit feminine आ *â*, which the common dialect has sometimes preserved, sometimes shortened, sometimes transformed into *η*.

119. The long *î* appears, in Sanskṛit, most frequently as a characteristic addition in the formation of feminine bases, thus, the feminine base महती *mahatî* (*magna*) springs from महत् *mahat*. The same holds good in Zend. Moreover, the feminine character *î* has been preserved most strictly in Lithuanian, where, for example, in the part. pres. and fut. an *i* is added to the old participial suffix *ant*, and *ěsant-i*, "the existing," *bú-sent-i*, "that that shall be," correspond to the Sanskṛit सती *sat-î* (for *asati* or *asanti*), भविष्यन्ती *bhav-i-ṣhyantî*. In Greek and Latin this feminine long *i* has become incapable of declension; and where it has still left traces, there a later unorganic affix has become the bearer of the case-terminations. This affix is, in Greek, either *α* or *δ*; in Latin, *c*. Thus, *ἡδεῖα* corresponds to the Sanskṛit स्वाद्वी *swâdw-î*, from स्वादु *swâdu*, "sweet"; *-τρια*, *-τριδ*, *e.g.* *ὀρχήστρια*, *ληστρίς*, *ληστρίδ-ος*, to the Sanskṛit त्री *trî*, *e.g.* जनित्री *janitrî*, "genitress," to which the Latin *genitrī-c-s*, *genitrī-c-is*, corresponds; while in the Greek *γενέτειρα*, and similar formations, the old feminine *i* is forced back a syllable. This [G. Ed. p. 140.] analogy is followed by *μέλαινα*, *τάλαινα*, *τέρεινα*, and substantive derivations, as *τέκταινα*, *Λάκαινα*. In *θεράπαινα*, *λέαινα*, the base of the primitive is, as in the nom. masc., shortened by a *τ*. In *θέαινα*, *λύκαινα*, it is to be assumed that the proper primitive in *ν* or *ντ* has been lost, or that these are formations of a different kind, and correspond to the rather isolated word in Sanskṛit इन्द्राणी *Indrâṇî*, as the wife of Indra, as derived from इन्द्र *Indra*, is termed. The cases where the feminine *i* is solely represented by *α* are essentially limited to feminine derivatives from forms in *ντ*, where *τ* passes into *σ*: the preceding *ν*, however, is replaced by *υ* or *ι*, or the mere lengthening of the preceding vowel, or it is assimilated to the *σ*:

hence,	*ουσ-α*,	*εισ-α*,	*εσσ-α*,	*ᾱσ-α**,	*ῡσ-α*
for	*οντ-α*,	*εντ-α*,	*εντ-α*,	*αντ-α*,	*υντ-α*.

---

* In Doric subsequent and original *αισ-α*.

To this analogy belong, moreover, the feminine substantives, like *θάλασσα, βασίλισσα, μέλισσα*, which J. Grimm (II. 328.) very correctly, in my opinion, compares with forms like *χαρί-εσσα, μελιτό-εσσα*, and explains the double *σ* by gemination or assimilation. The feminine formations by a simple *α* instead of the original *ι* are most corrupt, and, relatively, the most recent; and herein the Greek is not supported by any of the cognate languages. The Latin, its twin-sister, which otherwise runs parallel to it, leaves, in the part. pres. and other adjective bases terminating with a consonant, the feminine undistinguished from the masculine through all the cases, since it has no longer the power of declining the old *ī*.

120. The German, too, can no longer fully decline the old feminine *î*; and the Gothic, by a foreign affix, introduces it into the *ô* declension, but in the singular of substantives shortens the syllable *ỵô* in the [G. Ed. p. 141.] uninflected nominative and vocative to *i*, in the adjective to *ỵa*. More commonly, however, the old bases in *î* are introduced, by the frequently employed affix of an *n*, into the so-called weak declension; and as *î* in Gothic is denoted by *ei*, so to the Sanskṛit feminine participial bases in **अन्ती** *antî*, and to the fem. comparative bases in **ईयसी** *îyasî*, correspond the forms *ndein, izein*, regarding the nominative of which refer to §. 142.

121. The long *u* (*û*) appears, in Sanskṛit, rather seldom at the end of primary forms, and is for the most part feminine. The words most in use are **वधू** *vadhû*, "a wife," **भू** *bhû*, "earth," **श्वश्रू** *śwaśrû*, "mother-in-law" (*socrus*), **भ्रू** *bhrû*, "eyebrow." To the latter corresponds *ὀφρύς*, likewise with the long *υ*, the declension of which, however, is not different from that of the short *υ*; while in Sanskṛit the long *u* is distinguished from the short feminine *u* in the same way as **ई** *î* from **इ** *i*. But few monosyllabic primary forms end, in Sanskṛit, with diphthongs, not any at all with **ए** *ê*; with **ऐ** *âi* (from *â* + *i*, see §. 2.) only **रै** *rai*, masc. "thing," "riches"; in

the nom. irregularly रास् *râ-s* for रैस् *râi-s*. In this is recognised the Latin *re-s*. Still I do not believe that Latin bases in *ē* should therefore be looked upon as corresponding to the Sanskrit ऐ *âi*; for, in the first place, the Latin *ē* corresponds elsewhere to the Sanskrit ए *ê* (from *ă*+*i*), never to *âi*; secondly, the connection of the *ē* of the fifth declension with the originally long *a* of the first is not to be mistaken (to which it bears the same relation that the Ionic *η* does to the Doric *ᾱ*), for many words with the same meaning belong to the A and E declension; and, for example, a suffix which is employed for the formation of abstracts from adjectives is sounded as well *tiē* as *tia* (*planitie-s*, [G. Ed. p. 142.] *planitia*, *canitie-s*, *canitia*); and *iē-s*, and *ia*, in the formation of primitive and derivative words—like *effigie-s*, *effigia*, *pauperie-s*, *pauperia*—are clearly one and the same suffix, identical with the Sanskrit या *yâ*, which is used for the same purpose, and the Greek *ία*, Ionic *ίη*. Let us now consider the objections which are opposed to the original identity of the feminine *ē* and *a*. The most weighty is the *s* in the nom. sing. and pl.: *ē-s*, *ē-s* for *ē*, *ei*, as *musa*, *musæ* (*musai*), *κεφαλή*, *κεφαλαί*. As regards the *s* in the singular, it is, if the identity with the first declension be authentic, very remarkable; and forms like *species*, *canities*, seem to be true lingual patriarchs: for the Sanskrit, like the Zend, Greek, Gothic, Lithuanian, exhibits the absence of the nominative sign in the corresponding feminine bases in *a*. I have, however, never considered as original the abandonment of the nominative sign, and the complete equalization with the primary form in सुता *sutâ*, "daughter," and similar words, although it has appeared to me as losing itself very deeply in far-distant ages. The Latin, however, in some other points of Grammar, shews greater antiquity than the Sanskrit and Greek, as, for example (to confine the present instance to the nominative case), participial nominatives, like *amans*, *legens*, are better and older forms than the Sanskrit and Greek, like तुदन् *tudan*, λέγων, τιθείς, because they have preserved the nominative *s* together with the nasal, and therein stand on the same footing with Zend forms, like 𐬠𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬧𐬯 *bavaṅś*, "being." I cannot, therefore, find, in the retention of the nominative sign in the fifth declension, any decisive argument against its original identity with the first. We will treat hereafter of the *s* of the nominative plural. In the genitive singular the common form *ei* answers to *deae* (*deai*), the more rare, however, and better, in *ēs* to *familias*. Schneider searches, but fortunately without [G. Ed. p. 143.] success, for genitives like *die-is*: we require them as little, perhaps, as a *familia-is*, Let *dies* be written with Greek letters διη-ς, and then, perhaps, a *die-is* will be as little required as a δικη-ος. Although a few bases of the third declension, by rejecting a consonant or an entire syllable, have passed into the fifth declension, we will not therefore infer that all bases in *e* have arisen from such an abbreviation. If *QUIET*, after rejecting the *t*, could be declined according to the fifth declension, then must there necessarily have formerly been a fifth, *i.e.* there must have been bases in *ē*, otherwise from *QUIET* could only have come *QUII* (*quies*, *quiis*, like *cædes*); *i.e.* in spite of the rejection of the *t* it must have continued in the third declension. The connection between *rē-s* and the abovementioned Sanskṛit रै *râi* is, in my opinion, to be arrived at through the irregular nominative रास् *râ-s*; and according to this *re-s* would be supported on an old *â*: it answers to रास् *râ-s* as *rē-bus* to राभ्यस् *râ-bhyas*, and as in Greek γῆ-ν to the Sanskṛit गाम् *gâm*, "*terram*," which, in the remaining cases, has गो *gô* for its base. In Lithuanian there are feminine primary forms in *e* (Ruhig's third declension) which resemble the Greek η in the suppression of the singular nominative sign, but in the nominative plural in *e-s* approach more closely the Latin in *ē*.

122. Primary forms in ओ *ô* are rare in Sanskṛit: the only ones known to me are द्यो *dyô*, "heaven," and गो *gô*: the former is feminine, and properly proceeds from दिव् *div* (a radical word from दिव् *div*, "to shine") by the vocalization of the व् *v*, after which the vowel इ *i* becomes its semi-vowel य् *y*. In the accusative the *ô* bases change this diphthong into *â*. To the *â* thus obtained in द्याम् *dyâ-m*, [G. Ed. p. 144.] गाम् *gâ-m*, corresponds the Latin *e* of *die-m*, the Greek *η*, Doric *α*, of *γῆ-ν*, *γᾶ-ν*: the Latin *e*, however, is rendered short by the influence of the final *m*: the original language requires *diē-m*. In Sanskṛit, also, from दिव् *div*, "to shine," are derived appellations of day; as on the other side, in Latin, those for the heaven—*divum*, *sub divo*, *sub dio*—viz. दिवा *divâ*, as an adverb, "by day," and used as a primary form at the beginning of compounds; and also दिवस *divasa*, masc., and द्यु *dyu*, neuter (a contraction from *div*), which latter signifies both "day" and "heaven." To द्यु *dyu* answers, after rejecting the *d* (as *viginti* for *dviginti*), the Latin *Ju* of *Ju-piter*, "heavens-lord *or* father": the oblique cases *Jov-is*, *Jov-i*, *Jov-em* answer better to the broader theme द्यो *dyô*, whence the dative द्यवे *dyav-ê*, and the locat. द्यवि *dyav-i*. The *Djovis*, moreover, furnished by Varro, deserves mention, as that which keeps most faithfully to the ancient form. The Grecian *Ζεύς* signifies, therefore, in accordance with its origin primarily, "heaven": I form its relation to द्यो *dyô* thus, that after dropping the द् *d* the following semi-vowel य् *y* became *ζ* (§. 19.). The oblique cases, on the contrary (*Διός*, *Διί*, &c.), belong to the Sanskṛit द्यु *dyu*, and must originally have had a digamma, proceeding by the natural law of sound from *u*, after which change the semi-vowel *j* must have become a vowel. *Διός* has the same relation to *ΔιϜός*, that, in Latin, *sub dio* has to *sub divo*.

123. Let us now consider the second of the abovementioned primary forms in *ô*, viz. गो *gô*. It has several

meanings; but the most common are "bull," as masculine, and "cow" and "earth" as feminine. Both significations have in Zend, as in Greek, divided themselves into two forms. The Greek has preserved for the meaning "earth" the old guttural. With regard to the vowel, γῆ, γᾶ follows the example of the Indian accusative, where, as has been already remarked, गाम् *gâm* (γῆν) stands for *gô-m* [G. Ed. p. 145.] or *gav-am*. For the meaning "ox" the Greek has preserved the old diphthong—(for, for ओ *ô* = *a* × *u* may very well be expected, according to §. 4., ου)—but has exchanged the guttural medials for labials, as, p. 122 G. Ed., βίβημι for जगामि *jagâmi*. The base ΒΟΥ before vowels must originally have become ΒΟϜ; thus, in the dative, βοϜ-ί would answer to the Sanskṛit locat. गवि *gav-i*, and the Latin dative *bov-i*; but in the present state of the language the middle digamma between two vowels has always been dropped; and there is not, as with the initial digamma, the medium of metre for replacing it in the oldest writings. Only theory and comparative grammar can decide here. The Latin has, in the word *bō-s*, changed the vowels (*a* + *u*)—(which were originally of different kinds, but have been united into a diphthong)—into a homogeneous mass (cf. §. 4.), the nature of whose contraction, however, discloses itself before vowel inflexions, since the *u*-half of *BŌ* becomes *v*, and the short *a* is resolved into the form of a short *o*; thus, *bov-i* answers to the Sanskṛit locat. गवि *gav-i*. The Zend for the meaning "earth" has changed the guttural of the word under discussion into *z*, and gives in the nominative 𐬰𐬃 *zâo* for 𐬰𐬁𐬯 *zâs* (§. 56^b.), in the accusative 𐬰𐬄𐬨 *zaṅm* (§. 61.): I am not able to adduce other cases. For the meaning "ox" the guttural has remained in Zend, and the nominative is then 𐬔𐬁𐬎𐬯 *gâu-s* or 𐬔𐬁𐬋𐬯 *gâo-s*.

124. I know only two words in Sanskṛit which terminate in औ *âu*—नौ *nâu*, "ship," and ग्लौ *glâu*, "moon": the former has navigated very far on the ocean of our wide province of

language, without, however, in Sanskṛit, having arrived at a secure etymological haven. I believe नौ *nâu* to be an abbreviation of *snau* (cf. ῥέω, ῥεύω, *ruo*, with स्रु *sru*, p. 125 G. ed.), [G. Ed. p. 146.] and that it therefore proceeds from the root स्ना *snâ*, "to bathe," which originally, perhaps, may also have meant "to swim," and with which νάω, νέω, *na-to*, appear to be connected. नौ *nâu* would consequently be a radical word; and in regard to the vowel would stand for *nâ*, according to the analogy of ददौ *dadâu* (*dedi*, *dedit*) for *dadâ*, from *dadâ-a*. As *a*, according to §. 6., is a grave vowel, the Greek cannot represent the Sanskṛit Vṛiddhi-diphthong औ *âu* better than by αυ, while ओ *ô* (from short *a*+*u*) is commonly represented by ευ or ου. Hence नौस् *nâu-s* and ναῦ-ς correspond as exactly as possible; the υ of NAΥ, however, like that of BOΥ, has maintained itself only before consonants; and the digamma, which replaces it, is lost before vowel inflexions; νῆ-ες, νᾶ-ες, are from νᾶϝ-ες (Sansk. नावस् *nâv-as*), as βό-ες from βόϝ-ες. The Latin has given this word a foreign addition, and uses *navi-s*, *navi-bus*, for *nau-s*, *nau-bus*.* As the semi-vowel *v* is easily hardened to a guttural (§. 19.), we have here also, for *nau*, *nâv-am*, a sister form in our *Nachen*, Old High German *naccho*, "ship," gen. dat. *nacchin*.

125. We pass over to the consonants: of these, *n*, *t*, *s*, and *r* appear in Sanskṛit most frequently at the end of primary forms; all other consonants occur only in radical words, which are rare, and in some nominal bases of uncertain origin. We consider next the more rare or radical consonants. Of gutturals (*k*, *kh*, *g*, *gh*) we find none at

---

* Thus in German an *i* has been added to the above-mentioned गो *gô*, which, however, according to §. 117., is suppressed, together with the case sign in Old High German; hence *chuo*, "cow," gen. *chuoi*, where the *i* does not belong to the case designation, but to the here uninflected base.

the end of the nominal bases most in use; in Greek and Latin, on the contrary, they are of frequent occurrence; *c* is in Latin both radical and derivative, [G. Ed. p. 147.] *g* only radical—*DUÇ, VORAC, EDAC, LEG.* In Greek, κ, χ, and γ are only radical, or occur in words of unknown origin, as ΦΡΙΚ, ΚΟΡΑΚ, ’ΟΝΥΧ (Sanskṛit *nakha*), ΦΛΟΓ. Of the palatals, *ch* and *j* in Sanskṛit occur most frequently in वाच् *vâch*, "speech, voice" (*VOC*, ’ΟΠ); राज् *râj*, "king," the latter only at the end of compounds; असृज् *asṛij*, "blood" (*sanguis*): in Zend we have 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘 *druj*, f., as name of an evil demon, probably from the Sanskṛit root द्रुह् *druh*, "to hate." Of the two classes of the *T*-sound, the first, or lingual (ट् *ṭ*, &c.), is not used at the end of nominal bases; and therefore the second, dental, or proper *T*-class, is so much the more frequently employed. Still द् *d*, ध् *dh*, occur only in radical words, and therefore seldom; थ् *th* perhaps only in पथ् *path*, as the secondary theme of पथिन् *pathin*, "way"; nom. पन्थास् *panthâs*, from पन्थस् *panthas*, which I think I again recognise in the Latin *PONT, pons*. Other examples are, अद् *ad*, "eating," at the end of compounds, and युध् *yudh*, f., "strife." The letter त् *t* is so much the more common, that several of the most frequently employed suffixes end with it, as that of the part. pres. in अत् *at* or अन्त् *ant*, Greek and Latin *nt*. The Greek, besides τ, exhibits also δ and θ at the end of primary forms which are not radical; still ΚΟΡΥΘ and ’ΟΡΝΙΘ appear to me to be properly compounds, and to contain the roots ΘΗ, ΘΕ (the vowel being dropped) as their last member; and according to this, ΚΟΡΥΘ would properly mean "what is placed on the head"; so in Sanskṛit, शरद् *śarad*, "autumn," "rainy season," which Grammarians explain by a suffix *ad*, in my opinion means nothing but "water giving," and contains the root दा *dâ*, "to give," with *â* suppressed. ’ΟΡΝΙΘ finds in Greek itself no etymology: the Sanskṛit offers for its explanation अरणि *araṇi* (according to the pronunciation of Bengal, *oroni*), "wood"; and if ὀρνι is con- [G. Ed. p. 148.]

nected therewith, we may refer to *θέω*, "to run," in respect to the *θ*: "bird" therefore would derive its name from its going in the wood; while in Sanskrit, from its passage through the air, it is called, among other names, विहग *viha-ga*. Regarding the later origin of the δ in feminine bases in *ιδ*, an account is given in §. 119.; that is to say, patronymics in *ιδ* may be compared with Sanskrit ones in *í*, *e.g.* भैमी *bhaimí*, "the daughter of Bhîma. Probably, too, the δ in feminine patronymics in *αδ* is a later addition; they spring, like those in *ιδ*, not from their masculines, but directly from the primary word of the masculine, and, in my opinion, stand in sisterly, not in filial connection with them. In Latin, *d* appears as a more modern affix in the base *PECUD*, which the Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic terminate with *u* (Sans.-Zend, *paśu*, Goth. *faihu*). In Gothic, primary forms with a final *T*-sound are chiefly limited to the part. pres., where the old *t* appears changed into *d*, which remains without extraneous addition: there only, however, where the form stands substantively; otherwise, with the exception of the nominative, it is conducted by the affix *an* into a more current province of declension. The more modern German dialects under no circumstances leave the old *T*-sound without a foreign addition commixed with the base. In Lithuanian the participial suffix *ant*, in regard of the nom. sing. *ańs* for *ants*, rests exactly upon the Latin and Zend step, which extends beyond the Sanskrit; but in most of the remaining cases the Lithuanian cannot decline any more consonants, *i.e.* cannot unite them with pure case terminations, but transports them always, by a more modern affix, into a vowel-declension; and, indeed, to the participial suffix *ant* is added the [G. Ed. p. 149.] syllable *ia*, by the influence of which the *t* experiences the euphonic transformation into *ch* (= *tsch**). The nasal of this dental *T*-class, viz. the proper *n*, belongs to those consonants which occur most frequently at the end of nominal bases. In the German all the words of Grimm's weak declension like the Sanskṛit, and the masculine and feminine in Latin, reject in the nominative the *n* of the base, and thereby have a vowel termination. The Lithuanian presents the same appearance in the nominative, but in most of the oblique cases adds to a base in *en* sometimes *ia*, sometimes a simple *i*.

---

* This sound is expressed by *cz*, as in Mielcke's edition of Ruhig's Grammar.

126. Primary forms with a final labial, including the nasal (*m*) of this organ, appear in Sanskṛit only in naked roots, as the last member of compounds, and here, too, but seldom. In isolated use, however, we have अप् *ap* (probably from the root आप् *âp*, "to take in," "to comprehend"), "water," which is used only in the plural; in Zend, however, in the singular also.* In Greek and Latin, also, bases in *p*, *b*, *φ*, are either evidently radical, or of unknown origin, with probably radical letters at the end; or in Latin they have suppressed, in the nominative, a vowel belonging to the base; and so, as in [G. Ed. p. 150.] German, the first and fourth strong declensions, according to Grimm, have only the appearance of a base terminating with a consonant. Of this kind is *plebs*, from *plebis;* to explain which it is not requisite to turn, with Voss, to the Greek πλῆθος: one must keep to the Latin root *PLE*. The derivative *bis*, *bēs*, I explain like *bus*, *bundus*, *bilis*, *bam*,

---

* The Latin adds an *a* to this old consonantal base, and thus arises, according to the frequent interchange of *p* with *qu* (cf. *quinque* with पञ्चन् *panchan*), *aqua*; on the other hand, *am-nis* rests on the form *ap*, as *somnus* for *sopnus*, and *σεμνός*, for *σεβνός*, in analogy with a Sanskṛit euphonic law (Gramm. Crit. r. 58.). The Sanskṛit has from the same root another neuter, आपस् *âpas*, in which we recognise the Latin *æquor*, which therefore would not proceed from *æquus*, but is transferred from the waves, or the mirror of the sea, to other things of a similar nature. In Greek, *ἀφρός* appears to belong to the same origin.

bo (*amabam*, *-bo*), as from the root *FU*, "to be," which, like *FER*, often changes the *B* in its middle into *F* (§. 18.). Without appealing to the cognate languages, it is difficult, in Latin, to distinguish those bases which truly and originally terminate in a consonant from those which only appear to do so; for the declension in *i* has clearly operated on the consonantal declension, and introduced an *i* into different places in which it is impossible it could have stood originally. In the dative and ablative plural, the *i* of forms like *amantibus*, *vocibus*, admits of being explained as a conjunctive vowel, for facilitating the affix; it is, however, in my opinion, more correct to say that the bases *VOC*, *AMANT*, &c., because they could not unite with *bus*, have, in the present state of the Latin language, been lengthened to *VOCI*, *AMANTI*; so that we ought to divide *voci-bus*, *amanti-bus*, just as at §. 125. it was said of the Lithuanian, that in most cases it extends its participial bases in *ant* to *anchia* (euphonic for *antia*). This view of forms like *amanti-bus* is proved to be the more probable, in that in the genitive plural also before *um*, as before the *a* of neuters, an *i* frequently finds its place, without its being possible to say that in *amanti-um*, *amanti-a*, the *i* would be necessary to facilitate the annexation of the ending. On the other hand, *juveni-s*, *cani-s*, forming the genitives *canu-m*, *juven-um*, remind us of older bases in *n*; as in Sanskṛit श्वन् *śwan*, "a dog" (abbreviated शुन् *śun*), and युवन् *yuvan*, "young" (abbreviated यून् *yûn*), in Greek κύων, abbreviated [G. Ed. p. 151.] KYN, really close their theme with *n*. The German resembles the Latin in this point, that for the convenience of declension it has added an *i* to several numerals, whose theme originally terminated with a consonant; thus, in Gothic, from *FIDVŌRI* (Sanskṛit चतुर् *chatur*, in the strong cases §. 129. चत्वार् *chatwâr*) comes the dative *fidvôri-m*. The themes सप्तन् *saptan*, "seven," नवन् *navan*, "nine," दशन् *daśan*, "ten," by the addition of an *i*, in Old High German mould themselves to *SIBUNI, NIUNI, ZEHANI*; which forms, at the same time, pass as masculine nominatives, as these cases, in Old High German, have lost the case-suffix *s*. The corresponding Gothic nominatives, if they occurred, would be *sibunei-s, niunei-s, taihunei-s*. More on this point hereafter.

127. Of the semi-vowels (*y, r, l, v*), I have never found in Sanskṛit य् *y* and ल् *l* at the end of bases, and व् *v* only in the word दिव् *div*, before mentioned, which contracts itself in several cases to द्यो *dyô* and द्यु *dyu*. On the other hand, र् occurs very frequently, especially in words which are formed by the suffix तर् *tar*,* to which, in the cognate languages, likewise correspond bases in *r*. Moreover, *r* in Latin appears frequently as an alteration of an original *s*, as, in the comparative suffix *ior* (Sanskṛit ईयस् *îyas*); and, further, as an abbreviation of *ri-s, re*, as *l* for *li-s, le*; or, in the second declension, as abbreviated from *ru-s*; as in Gothic, *vair*, "man," for *vair*(*a*)*s*, belongs to bases in *a* (§. 116.). In Greek ʽΑΛ appears as a consonantal base; but in contrast with the [G. Ed. p. 152.] Sanskṛit सलिल *salila*, "water," ἅλ-ς appears abbreviated exactly in the same manner as μέγα-ς from μεγαλος.

128. Of the Sanskṛit sibilants, the two first (श् *ś*, ष् *ṣh*), as also the ह् *h*, are found only in radical words, and therefore seldom; स् *s*, on the contrary, concludes some very common suffixes used in the formation of words, as अस् *as*, which forms principally neuters, *e.g.* तेजस् *têjas*, "splendour," "strength," from तिज् *tij*, "to sharpen." The Greek appears to be without bases in Σ; this, however, proceeds from the following reason, that this sibilant between two

---

* Bases in अर् *ar* in several cases, and in the primary form also at the beginning of compounds, contract the syllable अर् *ar* to ऋ *ṛi*; and this ऋ *ṛi* is regarded by the Grammarians as their proper final sound. (§. 1.)

vowels, especially in the last syllable, is usually rejected; hence, neuters like *μένος*, *γένος* (from ΜΕΝΕΣ, ΓΕΝΕΣ, with change of the ε into ο), form in the genitive *μένεος*, *γένεος*, for *μένεσος*, *γένεσος*. The ς of the nominative, however, belongs, as I have already elsewhere remarked, to the base, and not to the case designation, as neuters have no ς in the nominative. In the dative plural, however, in the old epic language, the Σ, as it did not stand between two vowels, maintained itself; hence *τεύχεσ-σι*, *ὄρεσ-σι*; so likewise in compounds, like *σακέ*ς*-παλος*, *τελεσ-φόρος*, in which it would be wrong to assume the annexation of a Σ to the vowel of the base. In *γῆρας*, *γήρα-ος*, for *γήρασ-ος*, after restoring the Σ of the base, the form of word answers exactly to the Sanskṛit जरस् *jaras*, "age," although the Indian form is not neuter, but feminine. In Lithuanian, another remarkable remnant of the Sanskṛit suffixes terminating with *s* has been preserved, viz. in the partic. perf., in the oblique cases of which *us* corresponds to the Sanskṛit उष् *uṣh* (euphonic for उस् *us*) of the weakest cases (§. 130.); still, in Lithuanian, on account of the above-noticed incapacity for the declension of the consonants, the old *us* is conducted, as in other similar cases, by the subsequent addition of *ia*, *a* or *i*, partly into the *a*, partly into the [G. Ed. p. 153.] *i* declension; and only the nominative and the vocative, which is the same with it, belong, in the singular, to the consonantal declension.

129. The Sanskṛit and Zend have eight cases, viz. besides those which exist in Latin, an instrumental and a locative. These two cases exist also in Lithuanian; Ruhig calls the former the instrumental ablative, the latter the local ablative; in Lithuanian, however, the proper ablative—which in Sanskṛit expresses the relation "whence?"—is wanting. With reference to the primary form, which in Sanskṛit does not remain the same in all words, or

suffixes used in the formation of words through all the cases, a division of the cases into strong and weak is desirable for this language. The strong cases are the nominative, accusative, and vocative of the three numbers, with exception of the accusative plural, which, together with all the other cases, is weak. Where a double or triple formation of the primary form exists, there, with surprising regularity, the cases which have been designated as strong always exhibit the fullest form of the theme, which, from a comparison of languages, is proved to be the original one; while the other cases exhibit a weakened form of it, which appears also in the beginning of compounds, and hence is represented by the native Grammarians, according to §. 122., as the proper primary form. The pres. part. may serve as an example: it forms the strong cases with the suffix *ant*, but in the weak cases and in the beginning of compounds rejects *n*, which is retained by the cognate European languages, as also, for the most part, by Zend; so that अत् *at* is given as the suffix of this participle in preference to अन्त् *ant*. The root तुद् *tud*, "to vex," *e.g.* exhibits in the participle mentioned the form तुदन्त् *tu-dant* as the strong and original theme (cf. *tundent-em*), and तुदत् *tudat* as the weak theme; hence the masculine is declined, [G. Ed. p. 154.]

		STRONG CASES.	WEAK CASES.
Singular :	Nom. Voc.	तुदन् *tudan*	....
	Acc.	तुदन्तम् *tudantam*	....
	Instr.	......	तुदता *tudatâ.*
	Dat.	......	तुदते *tudatê.*
	Abl.	......	तुदतस् *tudatas.*
	Gen.	......	तुदतस् *tudatas.*
	Loc.	......	तुदति *tudati.*
Dual :	Nom. Acc. Voc.	तुदन्तौ *tudantâu*	....
	Instr. Dat. Abl.	......	तुदद्भ्याम् *tudadbhyâm.*
	Gen. Loc.	......	तुदतोस् *tudatôs.*

		STRONG CASES.	WEAK CASES.
Plural:	Nom. Voc.	तुदन्तस् *tudantas*	. . . .
	Acc.	. . . . . .	तुदतस् *tudatas.*
	Instr.	. . . . . .	तुदद्भिस् *tudadbhis.*
	Dat. Abl.	. . . . . .	तुदद्भ्यस् *tudadbhyas.*
	Gen.	. . . . . .	तुदताम् *tudatâm.*
	Loc.	. . . . . .	तुदत्सु *tudatsu.*

130. Where three formations of the primary form pervade the declension of a word or a suffix, the weakest form of the theme there occurs in those weak cases whose terminations begin with a vowel, the middle form before those case-suffixes which commence with a consonant. This rule makes a division of the cases into strong, weaker or middle, and weakest, desirable. (See Gramm. Crit. r. 185.)

131. In suffixes used in the formation of words, which in Sanskṛit separate into different forms, the Zend usually carries the strong form through all the cases; for instance, the part. pres. retains the nasal in most of the cases, which in Sanskṛit [G. Ed. p. 155.] proceed from the weakened theme. Words, however, are not wanting which follow the theory of the Sanskṛit gradations of form. Thus, the Sanskṛit base श्वन् *śwan,* "hound," which in the weakest cases is contracted to शुन् *śun,* appears in Zend likewise in a double form, and presents the weak genitive *ṡûn-ô* over against the strong nominative and accusative *ṡpâ, ṡpân-ĕm,* Sanskṛit श्वा *śwâ,* श्वानम् *śwânam* (§. 50.). The base *ap,* "water," which, in Sanskṛit, in the strong cases has a long *â,* but is not used in the singular, forms in the Zend the strong sing. nom. 𐬁𐬟𐬯 *âfs* (§. 40.), accus. 𐬁𐬞𐬆𐬨 *âpĕm;* on the other hand, *ap-ô,* "of the water," *ap-aṭ,* "from the water," &c.*

---

* This word occurs in the Codex of the V. S., edited by Burnouf, very frequently, and mostly with that quantity of the initial *a* which is required by the theory; so that where that is not the case it can only be imputed to an error in writing.

In the plural, where the Zend very frequently makes the nominative and accusative the same, confusion has, for this reason, crept in; and the weak 𐬯𐬏𐬥𐬋 *śûnô*, "*canes*," is found for 𐬯𐬞𐬁𐬥𐬋 *śpâno* in the nominative; and, on the other hand, the strong 𐬁𐬞𐬋 *âpô*, in the nominative as well as in the accusative.*

132. The Greek, in the declension of *κύων*, has limited the strong form to the nom. and voc. sing.: in [G. Ed. p. 156.] some cognate words in *ρ*, however, in accordance with the Sanskṛit, it has given the accusative also the strong form, in which the Gothic agrees with it. Compare *πατήρ*, *πατέρα*, *πάτερ*, *πατρί*, with पिता *pitâ*, पितरम् *pitaram*, पितर् *pitar*, पित्रि *pitri* (locat.); and the Gothic *brôthar*, as nom., accus., and vocat., opposed to *brôthrs*, "of the brother," *brôthr*, "to the brother," with the Sanskṛit भ्राता *bhrâtâ*, भ्रातरम् *bhrâtaram*, भ्रातर् *bhrâtar*, dative भ्रात्रे *bhrâtrê*, locat. भ्रात्रि *bhrâtri*. According to the same principle in bases in *an*, in Gothic, the *a* in the genitive and dative sing. is weakened to *i* (§. 140.); while the nominative, accus., and vocat. retain the original *a*; *e.g.* *ahma*, *ahmin-s*, *ahmin*, *ahman*, *ahma*, from *AHMAN*, "spirit" (§. 140.).

133. As regards the mode of combining the final vowels of the primary forms with case-suffixes beginning with a vowel, we must first draw attention to a phenomenon, which is almost limited to the Sanskṛit, and the dialects which

---

* I have, however, found also 𐬀𐬞𐬋 *apô* in the accusative; and am therefore in doubt, whether in this word, owing to the facile exchange of 𐬀 *a* and 𐬁 *â*, the confusion has not originated in mere graphical oversights. Thus, V. S. p. 21, we find: 𐬁𐬞𐬋 𐬬𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬎𐬍𐬱 𐬬𐬀𐬵𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬃 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬛𐬀𐬜𐬁𐬙𐬃 𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬊𐬥𐬍𐬱 𐬁𐬫𐬇𐬯𐬇 *âpô vaṇhuîs vahistâo mazdadhâtâo ashaonîs âyêśê*, "*aquas puras, optimas, ab Ormuzdo creatas, mundas celebro*"; and 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬞𐬃 𐬁𐬞𐬋 *vîśpâo âpô*, "*omnes aquas.*" On the other hand, in the page following: 𐬌𐬨𐬃 𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬗𐬀 𐬰𐬆𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬗𐬀 𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬃𐬯𐬗𐬀 𐬁𐬫𐬇𐬯𐬇 *imâo apaś-cha zĕmaś-cha urarâoś-cha âyêśê*, "*has aquasque terrasque arboresque celebro.*"

approximate most nearly to it, as Páli and Prâkṛit, through which, to avoid a hiatus, and to maintain pure the vowels of the base and of the termination, a euphonic *n* is introduced. This euphonic expedient cannot, in the extent in which it exists in Sanskṛit, belong to the original state of the language; otherwise it would not be almost entirely lost in the cognate European dialects, and even in the Zend. We therefore regard it as a peculiarity of the dialect, which, after the period of the division of languages, became the prevailing one in India, and has raised itself to be the universal written language in that country. It is necessary here to remark, that the Vêda language did not use the euphonic *n* so universally as the common Sanskṛit; and together with एना *ênâ*, इना *inâ*, उना *unâ*, occur also अया *ayâ*, इया *iyâ*, उया *uyâ*. The euphonic *n* is most frequently employed by the neuter [G. Ed. p. 157.] gender, less so by the masculine, and most rarely by the feminine: the latter limits its use to the plural genitive termination आम् *âm*, in which place it is introduced by the Zend also, although not as indispensably requisite. And it is remarkable, that precisely in this place in Old High German, and other Old German dialects, an *n* has been retained before the case-suffix; thus in Old High German, *ahô-n-ô*, "*aquarum*," from the feminine theme *AHŌ* (nom. *aha*). Besides the use of the euphonic *n*, there is further to be remarked, in Sanskṛit and Zend, the attachment of Guna to the vowels of the base (§. 26.) in certain cases, to which also the Gothic presents analogies.

SINGULAR.

NOMINATIVE.

134. Bases, of the masculine and feminine genders, ending with a vowel have, in the Sanskṛit family of languages, (under the limitation of §. 137.) *s* as nominative-suffix, which in Zend, after an *a* preceding it, always melts into *u*, and is then contracted with the *a* to *ô* (§. 2.), while this in Sanskṛit

takes place only before sonant letters (§. 25.)* Examples are given at §. 148. I find the origin of this case-designation in the pronominal base स *sa*, "he," "this," fem. सा *sâ*; and a convincing proof of this assertion is the fact, that the said pronoun does not extend beyond the limits of the nom. masc. and fem., but is replaced in the nom. neuter, and in the oblique cases of the masculine, by ता *ta*, and feminine ता *tâ* regarding which more hereafter.

135. The Gothic suppresses *a* and *i* be- [G. Ed. p. 158.] fore the case-suffix *s*, except in monosyllabic bases, where this suppression is impossible. *Hva-s*, "who?" *i-s*, "he," are used, but *vulf-s*, "wolf," *gast-s*, "stranger," for *vulfa-s*, *gasti-s* (cf *hosti-s*, according to §. 87.). In masculine substantive bases in *ja* (*ỵa*), however, the final vowel is retained, only weakened to *i* (§. 66.); *e.g. harỵi-s*, "army." If, however, as is generally the case, the final syllable is preceded by a long syllable, or by more than one, the *ji* (*ỵi*) is contracted to *ei* (=*î*, §. 70.); *e.g. ondei-s*, "end," *raginei-s*, "counsel," for *andỵi-s*, *raginỵi-s*. This contraction extends also to the genitive, which is in like manner denoted by *s*. To the Gothic nominatives in *ỵi-s* correspond the Lithuanian, like *Atpirktoỵi-s*, "Saviour," the *i* of which has likewise arisen from an elder *a*.† I deduce this from the majority of the oblique cases, which agree with those of the *a* bases. Where, however, in Lithuanian, a consonant precedes the final syllable *ỵa*, which is the more common case, there the *ỵ* is changed into the vowel *i*, and the following *i*, which had arisen from *a*, is suppressed: hence, *ỵaunikki-s*, "young man," for *ỵaunikkỵi-s* from *ỵaunikkỵa-s*. Hereto correspond in Gothic all adjective bases in *ỵa*,‡

---

* *E g.* सुतो मम *sutô mama*, "*filius meus*," सुतस् तव *sutas tava*, "*filius tuus*" (§. 22.).

† Through the influence of the *ỵ*, in accordance with a *Zend* law of euphony (§. 42.).

‡ Respecting the nom. *e.g.* of Gothic bases in *ỵa*, see p. 1309 G. Ed., Remark.

as *midi-ṣ* "the middle" (man), for *midyi-ṣ* from *midya-ṣ*, Sanskṛit मध्यस् *madhya-s*, The Zend also, in the *vocalization** of the syllable *ya*, presents a remarkable analogy to the Lithuanian and Gothic in contracting the syllable 𐬫𐬀 *ya* before a final 𐬨 *m* regularly to 𐬌 *i*, as also 𐬬𐬀 *va* to 𐬏 *û* (§. 42.).

136. The High German has, up to our time, preserved the old nominative sign in the changed form of *r*; nevertheless, as early as in the Old High German, in pronouns and adjectives only, with a vowel termination of the base. [G. Ed. p. 159.] The High German is, however, in this point, superior to the Gothic in fulness, that in its *a* bases—to which belong all strong adjectives—it has not suppressed the vowel before the case-sign, but preserved it in the form of *e*, which, in Old High German—as it appears through the influence of the *r*—is long, but only in polysyllabic, not in monosyllabic forms. Thus, *e.g.* *plint-êr*, "*cæcus*," completes the Gothic *blind-s* for *blinda-s*; as to the Gothic *i-s*, "he," corresponds *i-r*; Middle and New High German *e-r*. The Old Northern has likewise *r* as the nominative sign, and, in fact, everywhere where, in Gothic, *s* stands. In the other dialects the nominative character is entirely lost.

137. Feminine Sanskṛit bases in आ *â*, and, with very few exceptions, polysyllables in ई *î*, together with स्त्री *strî*, "wife," like the corresponding forms of the cognate languages, have lost the old nominative sign (with the exception of the Latin *ê* bases, see §. 121.), and give the pure base: the cognate languages do the same, the base having been weakened by the abbreviation of the final vowel. In Gothic, *ô* becomes *a* (§. 69.); only *sô*, "this," and *hwô* "which?" remain unshortened, on account of their being monosyllabic, as in Zend 𐬵𐬁 *hâ* and 𐬐𐬁 *kâ*; while in polysyllabic forms the

---

* I have used *vocalization* and *vocalize* to express the change of a semivowel to its corresponding vowel.—*Trans.*

𐬁 *â* is shortened. In Zend, 𐬍 *î* also is shortened, even in the monosyllabic 𐬯𐬙𐬭𐬍 *s̀trî*, "wife," see V. S. par. 136, (by Olshausen), p. 28, where we read 𐬯𐬙𐬭𐬌𐬗𐬀 *s̀tri-cha*, "*feminaque*"; whilst elsewhere the appended 𐬗𐬀 *cha* preserves the original length of the vowel. Here, too, the Zend nominatives in 𐬉 *ê* deserve to be mentioned, which seem very similar to the Greek in η; as 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬉 *pĕrĕnê*, "*plena*," which in the Vendidâd occurs very often in relation to 𐬰𐬁𐬊 *zâo*, "earth," without my being able to remember that I have found another case from 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬉 *pĕrĕnê*. But from the nom. 𐬐𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬉 *kainê*, "maid" (Sanskrit कन्या [G. Ed. p. 160.] *kanyâ*), which is of frequent occurrence, I find the accus. 𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬄𐬨 *kanyaṁm* (V. S. p. 420); this furnishes the proof that the 𐬉 *ê* in the nominative is generated by the euphonic influence of the suppressed 𐬌𐬌 *y* (§. 42.). In 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬎𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬉 *brâturyê*, "cousin," and 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬉 *tûiryê*, "a relation in the fourth degree" (V. S. p. 380), the 𐬌𐬌 *y* has remained; on the other hand, in 𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬁𐬐𐬉 *nyâkê*, "grandmother," the dropping of a 𐬌𐬌 *y* must be again assumed. We cannot here refrain from conjecturing that the *ē* also of the Latin fifth declension, as with very few exceptions it is everywhere preceded by an *i*, is likewise produced from *ā* by the influence of this *i*; so that the Latin here stands in reversed relation to the Greek, where ι rejects the combination with η, and preserves the original α (σοφία).

138. Bases of the masculine and feminine genders which terminate with a consonant, lose, in Sanskrit, according to §. 94., the nominative sign *s*; and if two consonants terminate the base, then, according to the same law, the latter of these also is lost. Hence, बिभ्रत् *bibhrat*, for बिभ्रत्स् *bibhrat-s*, "the bearer"; तुदन् *tudan*, for तुदन्त्स् *tudant-s* "the vexer"; वाक् *vâk* (from वाच् *vâch*, f.), for वाक्ष् *vâk-ṣh*, "speech." The Zend, Greek, and Latin, in preserving the nominative sign after consonants, stand in an older position than the Sanskrit; Zend 𐬁𐬟𐬯 *âf-s* (for *âp-s*, §. 40.), "water"

𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬟𐬯 *kĕrĕfs*, "body"; 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬗𐬯 *druc-s* (from the base *druj*), "a demon." The Latin and Greek, where the final consonant of the base will not combine with the *s* of the nominative, prefer abandoning a portion of the base, as χάρις for χάριτ-ς, *comes* for *comit-s* (cf. § 6.). The Latin, Æolic, and Lithuanian agree remarkably with the Zend in this point, [G. Ed. p. 161.] that *nt*, in combination with *s*, gives the form *ns*; thus *amans*, τιθένς, Lith. *sukańs* (§. 10.), correspond to the Zend 𐬯𐬭𐬁𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬧𐬯 *s̀râvayańs̀*, "the speaking" (man).

139. A final *n* after a short vowel is, in Sanskṛit, no favourite combination of sound, although one not prohibited. It is expelled from the theme in the first member of a compound, *e.g.* राजपुत्र *râja-putra*, "king's son," for राजन्पुत्र *rajan-putra*; and it is rejected in the nominative also, and a preceding short vowel is lengthened in masculines; *e.g.* राजा *râjâ*, "king," from राजन् *râjan*, m.; नाम *nâma*, "name," from नामन् *nâman*, n.; धनी *dhanî*, m., धनि *dhani*, n., from धनिन् *dhanin*, "rich." The Zend in this agrees exactly with the Sanskṛit; but from the dislike to a long *a* at the end, which has been before mentioned, omits the lengthening of the vowel; *e.g.* 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬬𐬀 *ashava*, "the pure" (man), from 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬥 *ashavan*, m.; 𐬗𐬀𐬱𐬨𐬀 *chashma*, "eye," from 𐬗𐬀𐬱𐬨𐬀𐬥 *chashman*, n. The Latin follows the Sanskṛit in the suppression of the *n* in the nominative, in the masculine, and feminine, but not in the neuter: *sermo, sermon-is, actio, action-is;* but *nomen*, not *nome* or *nomo*. The root *can* at the end of compounds, refrains from rejecting the *n*, probably in order not to weaken still more this weak radical syllable; thus *tubi-cen, fidi-cen, os-cen* (see §. 6.). *Lien* is an abbreviation of *lieni-s;* hence the retention of the *n* is not surprising. *Pecten* stands rather isolated. In Sanskṛit the naked roots also follow the principle of the rejection of *n*; हन् "slaying," "smiting," nom. हा *hâ*, is, however, the only root in *n* which I have

met with so used. श्वन् *śwan* "hound," nom. श्वा *śwâ*, which, in the weakest cases, contracts its theme to शुन् *śun*, is of obscure origin. The Latin has extended the base श्वन् *śwan*, in the nominative, by an unorganic addition, to *cani*; so युवन् *yuvan*, "young," has become *juveni* (cf. §. 126.). As regards the opposition [G. Ed. p. 162.] between *o* and *i*, by which, in several words—as *homo*, *homin-is*, *arundo*, *arundin-is*—the nominative is distinguished from the oblique cases, this *o* appears to me a stronger vowel,* which compensates for the loss of the *n*, and therefore is substituted for the weaker *i*; according to the same principle by which, in Sanskrit, the nom. धनी *dhanî*,† comes from धनिन् *dhanin*; and, in Lithuanian, bases in *en* and *un* give, in the nominative, *ů* (=*uo*) for *e* or *u*. Thus, from the bases *AKMEN*, "stone," *SZUN*, "hound," come the nominatives *akmů*, *szů*; as in Sanskrit, from the primary forms of the same signification, अश्मन् *aśman*, श्वन् *śwan*, have arisen अश्मा *aśmâ* and श्वा *śwâ*. It does not follow that *homin-is* has come from *homon-is*,‡ because the old language had *hemo*, *hemonis*, for *homo*, *hominis*; but *mon* and *min* are cognate suffixes, signifying the same, and were originally one, and therefore may be simultaneously affixed to one and the same word.

140. The German language also rejects a final *n* of the base in the nominative and in the neuter, in the accu-

---

* Although its quantity in the actual condition of the language is arbitrary, still it appears to have been originally long, and to imply a similar contrast to the Greek ην, εν-ος; ων, ον-ος. For the rest it has been already remarked, that between short vowels also exists a difference of gravity (§. 6.).

† In bases in अन् *an* the lengthening extends to all the strong cases, with the exception of the vocat. sing.; thus, not merely राजा *râjâ*, "*rex*," but also राजानम् *râjân-am*, "*regem*," राजानस् *râjânas*, "*reges*."

‡ I now prefer taking the *i* of *homin-is*, &c., as the weakening of the *o* of *homo*. The relation resembles that of Gothic forms like *ahmin-is*, *ahmin*, to the nom. and acc. *ahma*, *ahman*, which preserve the original vowel.

sative also, like Sanskṛit. In Gothic, in the masculine and neuter—where alone, in my opinion, the *n* has an old and original position—an *a* always precedes the *n*. There are, that is to say, only bases in *an*, none in *in* and *un*; the latter termination is foreign to the Sanskṛit also. [G. Ed. p. 163.] The *a*, however, is weakened to *i* in the genitive and dative (see §. 132.); while in Sanskṛit, in these cases, as especially in the weakest cases (§. 130.), it is entirely dropped.* Among masculine bases in *an*, in Gothic, exist several words, in which *an* is the whole derivative-suffix, and which therefore correspond to the Sansk. राजन् *râj-an*, "king," as "ruler." Thus *AH-AN*, "spirit," as "thinker" (*ah-ya*, "I think"), *STAU-AN*, "Judge" (*stau-ya*, "I judge"), whence the nominatives *aha, staua*. There are also, as in Sanskṛit, some masculine formations in *man*; as, *AHMAN*, "spirit," nom. *ahma*, with which perhaps the Sansk. आत्मन् *âtman*, "soul," nom. आत्मा *âtmâ*, is connected; in case this stands for *âh-man*, and comes from a lost root आह् *âh*, "to think,"† where it is to be remembered that also the root नह् *nah*, "to bind," has, in several places, changed its *h* into *t*. The Gothic *MILH-MAN*, nom. *milh-ma*, "cloud," appears to have sprung from the Sanskṛit root *mih*, by the addition of an *l*, whence, remarkably enough, by the suffix *a*, and by exchanging the ह् *h* for घ् *gh*, arises the nominal base मेघ *mêgha*, "cloud." In Latin *ming-o* answers to मिह् *mih*, and in Greek ὀ-μιχ-έω; the meaning is in the three languages the same.

141. Neuter bases in *an*, after rejecting the *n*, lengthen, in Gothic, the preceding *a* to *ô*, in the nominative, accusa-

---

* In case two consonants do not precede the termination अन् *an*; *e.g.* आत्मनस् *âtman-as*, not *âtmn-as*, but नाम्नस् *nâmn-as*, not *nâman-as*, "*nominis.*"

† Perhaps identical with the actually-occurring आह् *âh*, "to speak," as मन् *man*, "to think," in Zend means also "to speak"; whence 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬭𐬀 *manthra*, "speech," and in Gothic *MUN-THA*, nom. *munths*, "mouth" §. 66.).

tive, and vocative, which sound the same; [G. Ed. p. 164.] so that in these cases the Gothic neuter follows the theory of the strong cases (§. 129.), which the Sanskṛit neuter obeys only in the nom., accus., and vocat. plural, where, for example, चत्वारि *chatwâr-i*, "four," with a strong theme, is opposed to the weak cases like चतुर्भिस् *chaturbhis* (instr.), चतुर्भ्यस् *chaturbhyas*. The *a*, also, of neuter bases in *an* is lengthened in the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural in Sanskṛit, and in Gothic; and hence नामानि *nâmân-i*, Gothic *namôn-a*, run parallel to one another. However, in Gothic *namn-a* also exists, according to the theory of the Sanskṛit weakest cases (§. 130.), whence proceeds the plural genitive नाम्नाम् *nâmn-âm*, "*nominum*"; while the Gothic *namôn-ê* has permitted itself to be led astray by the example of the strong cases, and would be better written *namn-ê* or *namin-ê*.

142. In the feminine declension in German I can find no original bases in *n*, as also in Sanskṛit there exist no feminines in *an* or *in*; but feminine bases are first formed by the addition of the usual feminine character ई *î*; as, राज्ञी *râjnî*, "queen," from राजन् *râjan*; धनिनी *dhaninî*, "the rich" (fem.), from धनिन् *dhanin*, m. n. "rich." Gothic feminine substantive bases in *n* exhibit, before this consonant, either an *ô* (= आ, §. 69.) or *ei*: these are genuine feminine final vowels, to which the addition of an *n* can have been only subsequently made. And already, at §. 120., a close connection of bases in *ein* (= *în*) with the Sanskṛit in ई *î*, and Lithuanian in *i*, has been pointed out. Most substantive bases in *ein* are feminine derivatives from masculine-neuter adjective bases in *a*, under the same relation, excluding the modern *n*, as in Sanskṛit that of सुन्दरी *sundarî*, "the fair" (woman), from सुन्दर *sundara* m. n. "beautiful." Gothic substantive bases in *ein* for the most part raise the adjective, whence they are derived, to an abstract;

---

* Vide p. 1083, Note.

[G. Ed. p. 165.] *e.g.* *MANAGEIN*, "crowd, nom. *managei*, from the adjective base *MANAGA* (nominative masc. *manag-s*, neut. *managa-ta*); *MIKILEIN*, nom. *mikilei*, "greatness," from *MIKILA* (*mikil-s*, *mikila-ta*), "great." As to feminine bases in *ôn*, they have arisen from feminine bases in *ô*; and I have already observed that feminine adjective bases in *ôn*—as *BLINDŌN*, nom. *blindô*, gen. *blindôn-s*—must be derived, not from their masculine bases in *an*, but from the primitive feminine bases in *ô* (nom. *a*, Grimm's strong adjectives). Substantive bases with the genitive feminine in *ôn* presuppose older ones in *ô*; and correspond, where comparison is made with old languages connected in their bases, to Sanskṛit feminines in *â*, Greek in *α*, *η*, Latin in *a*; and in these old languages never lead to bases with a final *n*. Thus, *TUGGŌN* (pronounced *tungôn*), nom. *tuggô*, answers to the Latin *lingua*, and to the Sanskṛit जिह्वा *jihwâ*, (= *dschihwâ*, see §. 17.); and *DAURŌN*, nom. *daurô*, to the Greek *θύρα*; *VIDŌVŌN*, nom. *vidôvô*, "widow," to the Sanskṛit विधवा *vidhavâ*, "the without man" (from the prep. वि *vi* and धव *dhava*, "man"), and the Latin *vidua*. It is true that, in *MITATHỴŌN*, "measure," nom. *mitathỵô*, the suffix *thỵôn* completely answers to the Latin *tion*, *e.g.* in *ACTION;* but here in Latin, too, the *on* is a later addition, as is evinced from the connection of *ti-on* with the Sanskṛit suffix ति *ti*, of the same import, and Greek *σι-ς* (old *τις*), Gothic *ti*, *thi*, *di* (see §. 91.). And in Gothic, together with the base *MITATHỴŌN* exists one signifying the same, *MITATHI*, nom. *mitaths*. In *RATHỴŌN*, nom. *rathỵô*, "account," a relationship with *RATION*, at least in respect of the suffix, is only a seeming one; for in Gothic the word is [G. Ed. p. 166.] to be divided thus, *rath-ỵôn* : the *th* belongs, in the Gothic soil, to the root, whence the strong part. *rathan(a)-s* has been preserved. The suffix *ỵôn*, of *RATHỴŌN* therefore corresponds to the Sanskṛit *yâ*; *e.g.* in विद्या *vid-yâ*, "knowledge." Of the same origin is *GA-RUN-ỴŌN*, nom. *garunỵô*, "inundation."

143. If a few members of a great family of languages have suffered a loss in one and the same place, this may be accident, and may be explained on the general ground, that all sounds, in all languages, especially when final, are subject to abrasion; but the concurrence of so many languages in a loss in one and the same place points to relationship, or to the high antiquity of such a loss; and in the case before us, refers the rejection of an *n* of the base in the nominative to a period before the migration of languages, and to the position of the original site of the human races, which were afterwards separated. It is surprising, therefore, that the Greek, in this respect, shews no agreement with its sisters; and in its *ν* bases, according to the measure of the preceding vowel, abandons either merely the nominative sign, or the *ν* alone, never both together. It is a question whether this is a remnant of the oldest period of language, or whether the *ν* bases, carried away by the stream of analogies in the other consonantal declensions, and by the example of their own oblique cases, which do not permit the remembrance of the *ν* to be lost, again returned, at a comparatively later period, into the common and oldest path, after they had experienced a similar loss to the Sanskṛit, Zend, &c., by which we should be conducted to nominative forms like *εὐδαίμω*, *εὔδαιμο*, *τέρη*, *τέρε*, *τάλᾱ*, *τάλᾰ*? I do not venture to decide with positiveness on this point, but the latter view appears to be the more probable. It here deserves to be [G. Ed. p. 167.] remarked, that, in German, the *n*, which in Gothic, in the nominative, is always suppressed, has in more modern dialects made its way in many words from the oblique cases again into the nominative. So early as the Old High German this was the case; and, in fact, in feminine bases in *în* (Gothic *ein*, §. 70.), which, in the nominative, oppose to the Gothic *ei* the full base *în*: as *guotlihhîn*, "glory" (see Grimm, p. 628). In our New High

German the phenomenon is worthy of notice, that many original *n* bases of the masculine gender, through a confusion in the use of language, are, in the singular, treated as if they originally terminated in *na; i.e.* as if they belonged to Grimm's first strong declension. Hence the *n* makes its appearance in the nominative, and the genitive regains the sign *s*, which, indeed, in Gothic, is not wanting in the *n* bases, but in High German was withdrawn from them more than a thousand years since. Thus, *Brunnen, Brunnens*, is used instead of the Old High German *prunno, prunnin*, and the Gothic *brunna, brunnin-s*. In some words, together with the restored *n* there occurs in the nominative, also, the ancient form with *n* suppressed, as *Backe* or *Backen, Same* or *Samen;* but the genitive has in these words also introduced the *s* of the strong declension. Among neuters the word *Herz* deserves consideration. The base is, in Old High German, *HERZAN*, in Middle High German *HERZEN*; the nominatives are, *herza, herze;* the New German suppresses, together with the *n* of *Herzen*, the vowel also, as is done by many masculine *n* bases; as, *e.g. Bär* for *Bäre.* As this is not a transition into the strong declension, but rather a greater weakening of the weak nominative, the form *Herzens*, therefore, in the genitive, for an uninflected *Herzen*, is sur-
[G. Ed. p. 168.] prising. With this assumed or newly-restored inflection *s* would be to be compared, in Greek, the nominative ς, as of δελφί-ς, μέλα-ς; and with the *n* of *Brunnen* for *Brunne*, the ν of δαίμων, τέρην; in case, as is rendered probable by the cognate languages, these old forms have been obtained from still older, as δελφί, μέλα, δαίμω, τέρη, by an unorganic retrogade step into the stronger declension.*

---

* That, in Greek, the renunciation of a ν of the base is not entirely unknown may be here shewn by an interesting example. Several cardinal numbers in Sanskrit conclude their base with न् *n*; viz. *panchan*,

144. Bases in अर् *ar* (ऋ *ṛi*, §. 1.) in Sanskṛit reject the *r* in the nominative, and, like those in न् *n*, lengthen the preceding vowel ; *e.g.* from पितर् *pitar*, "father," भ्रातर् *bhrâtar*, "brother," मातर् *mâtar*, "mother," दुहितर् *duhitar*, "daughter," come पिता *pitâ*, भ्राता *bhrâtâ*, माता *mâtâ*, दुहिता *duhitâ*. The lengthening of the *a* serves, I believe, as a compensation for the rejected *r*. As to the retention, however, through all the strong cases, excepting the vocative, of the long *a* of the agent, which corresponds to Greek formations in τηρ, τωρ, and to Latin in *tōr*, this takes place because, in all probability, in these words तार् *târ*, and not तर् *tar*, is the original form of the suffix; and this is also supported by the length of the suffix being retained in Greek and Latin through all the cases—τηρ, τωρ, *tōr*; only [G. Ed. p. 169.] that in Latin a final *r*, in polysyllabic words, shortens an originally long vowel. Compare

	SANSKṚIT.	GREEK.	LATIN.
Nom. sing.	दाता *dâtâ*,	δοτήρ,	*datōr*,
Acc. sing.	दातारम् *dâtâr-am*,	δοτῆρ-α,	*datōr-em*,
N. A. V. dual,	दातारौ *dâtâr-au*,	δοτῆρ-ε,	. . . . . .
Nom. Voc. pl.	दातारस् *dâtâr-as*,	δοτῆρ-ες,	*datōr-es*.

The Zend follows the analogy of the Sanskṛit, both in the rejection of the *r* in the nominative, and in the length

---

panchan, "five," *saptan*, "seven," *aṣhṭan* with *aṣhṭau*, "eight," *navan*, "nine," *daśan*, "ten." These numerals are, indeed, used adjectively, when they are not governed by the gender of their substantive, but display always a neuter form, and indeed, which is surprising, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative sing. terminations, but in the other cases the suitable plural endings; *e.g.* पञ्च राजानस् *pancha* (not *panchânas*) *râjânas* "*quinque reges*"; on the other hand, पञ्चसु राजसु *panchasu râjasu* "*in quinque regibus*." To the neuter nominatives and accusative of the singular पञ्च *pancha*, सप्त *sapta*, नव *nava*, and दश *daśa*—which rest on the regular suppression of the *n*—answer the Greek πέντε, ἑπτά, ἐννέα, δέκα, with the distinction that they have become quite indeclinable, and retain the old uninflected nominative through all the cases.

of the preceding *a* of the noun agent, in the same places as in the Sanrkṛit, with the exception of the nominative singular, where the long *a*, as always when final, is shortened; *e. g.* 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬀 *paita*, "father," 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀 *dâta*, "giver," "Creator;" acc. 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬨 *paitar-ĕm*, 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬭𐬆𐬨 *dâtâr-ĕm*. In Lithuanian there are some interesting remains, but only of feminine bases in *er*, which drop this letter in the nominative, but in most of the oblique cases extend the old *er* base by the later addition of. an *i*. Thus *motė*, "wife," *duktė* "daughter," answer to the abovementioned माता *mâtâ*, दुहिता *duhitâ*; and, in the plural, *moter-ės*, *dukter-ės*, to मातरस् *mâtar-as*, दुहितरस् *duhitar-as*. In the genitive singular I regard the form *moter-s*, *dukter-s*, as the elder and more genuine, and *moteriês*, *dukteriês*, as corruptions belonging to the *i* bases. In the genitive plural the base has kept clear of this unorganic *i*; hence, *moter-û*, *dukter-û*, not *moteri-û*, *dukteri-û*. Besides the words just mentioned, the base *SESSER*, "sister," belongs to this place: it answers to the Sanskṛit स्वसर् *swasar*, nom. स्वसा *swasâ*; but distinguishes itself in the nominative from *mote* and *dukte*, in that the *e*, after the analogy of bases in *en*, passes into *ů*, thus *sessů*.

[G. Ed. p. 170.] 145. The German languages agree in their *r* bases (to which but a few words belong denoting affinity) with the Greek and Latin in this point, that, contrary to the analogy just described, they retain the *r* in the nominative. As πατήρ, μητήρ, θυγάτηρ, δαήρ (Sanskṛit, देवर् *dêvar*, देवृ *dêvṛi*; nom. देवा *dêvâ*), *frater*, *soror*; so in Gothic, *brôthar*, *svistar*, *dauhtar*; in Old High German, *vatar*, *pruodar*, *suëstar*, *tohtar*. It is a question whether this *r* in the nominative is a remnant of the original language, or, after being anciently suppressed, whether it has not again made its way in the actual condition of the language from the oblique cases into the nominative. I think the latter more probable; for the Sanskṛit, Zend, and Lithuanian are three witnesses for the antiquity of the suppression of the *r;* and the Greek words like *πατήρ, μήτηρ, σωτήρ, ῥήτωρ,* exhibit something peculiar and surprising in the consonantal declension, in that *ρ* and *ς* not combining, they have not rather preferred giving up the base-consonant than the case-sign (as *παῖς, ποῦς,* &c.). It would appear that the form *της* is of later origin, for this reason, that the *ρ* having given place to the nominative *ς*, the form *τη-ς*, whence *τηρ-ος* should come, was, by an error of language, made to correspond to the *η-ς* of the first declension. The want of a cognate form in Latin, as in Zend and Sanskṛit, as also the, in other respects, cognate form and similarity of meaning with तार् *târ, tō-r, τηρ* and *τωρ*, speak at least plainly enough for the spuriousness and comparative youth of the nouns of agency in *της*.

146. Masculine and feminine primary forms in अस् *as* in Sanskṛit lengthen the *a* in the nominative singular. They are, for the most part, compounded, and contain, as the last member, a neuter substantive in अस् *as*, as दुर्मनस् *durmanas*, "evil-minded," from दुस् *dus* [G. Ed. p. 171.] (before sonant letters—§. 25.—दुर् *dur*) and मनस् *manas*, "mind," whence the nom. masc. and fem. दुर्मनास् *durmanâs*, neut. दुर्मनस् *durmanas*. A remarkable agreement is here shewn by the Greek, in *δυσμενής, ὁ, ἡ* opposed to *τὸ δυσμενές*. The स् *s* of दुर्मनास् *durmanâs*, however, belongs, though unrecognised, to the base; and the nominative character is wanting, according to §. 94. In Greek, on the other hand, the *ς* of *δυσμενής* has the appearance of an inflexion, because the genitive, &c., is not *δυσμενέσ-ος*, like the Sanskṛit दुर्मनसस् *durmanas-as*, but *δυσμενέος*. If, however, what was said at §. 128 is admitted, that the *ς* of *μένος* belongs to the base, and *μένεος* is abbreviated from *μένεσ-ος*, then in the compound *δυσμενής* also, and all similar adjectives, a Σ belonging to the base must be recognised, and the form *δυσμενέσος* must lie at the bottom of the genitive *δυσμενέος*. In the

nominative, therefore, either the ς belongs to the base, and then the agreement with दुर्मनास् *durmanâs* would be complete; or the ς of the base has been dropped before the case-sign ς. The latter is, in my opinion, least probable; for the former is supported by the Latin also, where the forms which answer to the Sanskṛit *as* bases are in the nom. masc. and fem. in like manner without the case-sign. Thus the Sanskṛit comparative suffix is ईयस् *îyas*—the last *a* but one of which is lengthened in the strong cases, and invested with a dull nasal (Anuswâra, §. 9.)—in Latin, *iōr*, with the *s* changed into *r*, which so frequently happens; and the nominative in both genders is without the case-sign: the originally long *o*, however, is shortened by the influence of the final *r*. In the neuter *ŭs* corresponds to the Sanskṛit अस् *as*, because *u* is favourable to a final *s*, and prevents its transition into *r*; hence *gravius* has the same relation to the Sanskṛit गरीयस् *garîyas* (irregular from गुरु *guru*, "heavy,") as *lupus* to [G. Ed. p. 172.] वृकस् *vrikas*, only that the *s* of the nominative character in the latter belongs in the former to the base. The final syllable *ŏr*, though short, must nevertheless be held, in Latin, as graver than *ŭs*, and hence *gravior* forms a similar antithesis to *gravius* that in Greek δυσμενής does to δυσμενές, and in Sanskṛit दुर्मनास् *durmanâs* to दुर्मनस् *durmanas*.

147. In Lithuanian a nominative, which stands quite isolated, *mėnů* (= *mėnuo*), "moon" and "month," deserves here to be mentioned: it proceeds from the primary form *MENES**, and, in regard to the suppression of the final consonant and the transformation of the preceding vowel, has the same relation to it that, as above (§. 139.), *akmů* has

---

* The relation of this to मास् *mâs*, which signifies the same—from मास् *mâs*, "to measure," without a derivative suffix—is remarkable; for the interposed nasal syllable *ne* answers to the Sanskṛit न *na* in roots of the seventh class (see p. 118); and in this respect *MENES* bears the same relation to the Latin *MENSI* that l. c. भिनद्मि *bhinadmi* does to *findo*.

to *AKMEN*, *sessû* to *SESSER:* in the oblique cases, also, the *s* of the base again re-appears, but receives, as in the *er* and *en* bases, an unorganic increase: thus the genitive is *menesio*, whence *MENESIA* is the theme; as *wilko*, "*lupi*," from *WILKA*, nom. *wilka-s*.

148. In neuters, throughout the whole Sanskṛit family of languages the nominative is identical with the accusative, which subject is treated of at §. 152. &c. We here give a general view of the nominative formation, and select for the several terminations and gender of the primary forms, both for these cases and for all others which suit our purpose, the following examples: Sanskṛit वृक *vṛika*, m. "wolf;" क *ka*, "who?" दान *dâna*, n. "gift;" त *ta*, n. "this;" जिह्वा *jihwâ*, f. "tongue;" का *kâ*, "which?" पति *pati*, m. "lord," "husband;" प्रीति *prîti*, f. "love;" वारि *vâri*, n. "water;" भविष्यन्ती *bhavishyantî*, "who is about to be;" सूनु *sûnu*, m. "son;" [G. Ed. p. 173.] तनु *tanu*, f. "body;" मधु *madhu*, n. "honey," "wine;" वधू *vadhû*, f. "wife;" गो *gô*, m. f. "bullock," "cow;" नौ *nâu*, f. "ship." Of the consonantal declension we select only such final consonants as occur most frequently, whether in single words or in entire classes of words: वाच् *vâch*, f. "speech"*; भरन्त् *bharant*, in the weakened form, भरत् *bharat* (§. 129.) m. n. "bearing," "receiving," from भर् *bhar* (भृ *bhṛi*) cl. 1.; आत्मन् *âtman*, m. "soul;" नामन् *nâman*, n. "name;" भ्रातर् *bhrâtar*, m. "brother;" दुहितर् *duhitar*, f. "daughter;" दातर् *dâtar*, m. "giver;" वचस् *vachas*, n. "speech," Greek, 'ΕΠΕΣ, ἔπος (§§. 14. 128.), for ϜΕΠΕΣ, Ϝεπος. Zend, 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬵𐬐𐬀 *vĕrhka*, m. "wolf;" 𐬐𐬀 *ka*, m. "who?" 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀 *dâta*, n. *datum*; 𐬙𐬀 *ta*, n. "this;" 𐬵𐬌𐬰𐬬𐬁 *hizvâ*, f. "tongue;" 𐬐𐬁 *kâ*, "which?"

---

* Masculines and feminines in the consonantal declension agree in all cases: hence an example of one of the two genders is sufficient. The only exception is the accusative plural of words denoting relationship in अर् *ar* (ऋ, §. 114.), which form this case from the abbreviated theme in ऋ *ṛi*.

𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *paiti,* m. (§. 41.) "Lord;" 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬌 *âfrîti,* f. "blessing;" 𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌 *vairi,* n. "water;" 𐬠𐬏𐬱𐬫𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬙𐬍 *bûshyaintî,* "who will be;" 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎 *paśu,* m. "tame animal;" 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎 *tanu,* f. "body;" 𐬨𐬀𐬜𐬎 *madhu,* n. "wine;" 𐬔𐬋 *gô,* m. f. "bullock," [G. Ed. p. 174.] "cow"*; 𐬬𐬁𐬗 *vâch,* f. "speech," "voice"†; 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬥𐬙 *barant,* or 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬙 *barĕnt,* weakened form 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬙 *barat,* m. n. "bearing;" 𐬀𐬯𐬨𐬀𐬥 *aśman,* m. "heaven;" 𐬥𐬁𐬨𐬀𐬥 *nâman* (also 𐬥𐬀𐬣𐬨𐬀𐬥 *naṅman*), n. "name;" 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭 *brâtar,*‡

---

* It has been remarked at §. 123 of the cognate nom. 𐬰𐬃 *zâo,* "earth," accus. 𐬰𐬀𐬣𐬨 *zaṅm,* that I have only met with these two cases. The very common form 𐬰𐬆𐬨 *zĕm,* which is found only in the other oblique cases, is nevertheless represented by Burnouf, in a very interesting article in the *Journal des Savans* (Aug. 1832), which I only met with after that page had been printed, as belonging to the same theme. I agree with him on this point at present, so much the rather as I believe I can account for the relationship of 𐬰𐬆𐬨𐬉 *zĕmê,* "*terræ,*" (dat.) 𐬰𐬆𐬨𐬌 *zĕmi,* "*in terra,*" &c. to the Sanskrit गवे *gavê,* गवि *gavi.* I do not doubt, that is to say, that, in accordance with what has been remarked at §. 63. and p. 114, the Zend 𐬨 *m* is to be regarded as nothing else than the hardening of the original *v.* The Indian गो *gô,* before vowel terminations *gav,* would consequently have made itself almost unintelligible in the meaning "earth," in Zend, by a double alteration; first by the transition of *g* to *z,* in which *j* must be assumed as the middle step—in which *e.g.* 𐬘𐬀𐬨 *jam,* "to go," from गम् *gam,* has remained; secondly, by the hardening of the *v* to *m.* Advert, also, to the Greek δη, for γη, in δημήτηρ; since δ and 𐬰 *z,* from ज *j* (=*dsch*), have so divided themselves in the sound whence they have sprung, that the Greek has retained the *T*-sound, the Zend the sibilant.

† I cannot quote the nominative of this word; but it can only be 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬯 *vâc-s,* as palatals before 𐬯 *s* change into 𐬗 *c*; and thus, from 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘 *druj,* "an evil demon," occurs very frequently the nom. 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬗𐬯 *druc-s.* I have scarcely any doubt, too, that what Anquetil, in his Vocabulary, writes *vâhksch,* and renders by "*parler, cri,*" is the nominative of the said base; as Anquetil everywhere denotes 𐬗 by *kh,* and 𐬯 by *sch.*

‡ In the theme we drop, intentionally, the 𐬆 *ĕ* required by §. 44, as it is clear that 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭 *brâtar,* not 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬆 *brâtarĕ,* must be the base word; 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬙𐬀𐬭 *baratar* also occurs, with 𐬀 *a* interposed.

m. "brother;" 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬀𐬭 *dughdhar*, f. "daughter;" 𐬛𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭 *dâtar*, m. "giver," "creator;" 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬋 *vachô*, n. (§. 56^b.) "word." It is not requisite to give here examples in Greek and Latin: from Lithuanian and Gothic we select the bases, Lith. *WILKA*, Goth. *VULFA*, m. "wolf;" Lith. *KA*, Goth. *HVA*, m. "who?" Lith. *GERA*, n. "good;" *TA*, n. "the;" Goth. *DAURA*, n. "gate," (Sanskrit, द्वार *dwâra*, n.); *THA*, n. "this:" Lith. *RANKA*, f. "hand;" Goth, *GIBŌ*, f. "gift" (§. 69.); *HVŌ*, f. "which?"; Lith. *PATI*, m. "Lord"*; Goth. *GASTI*, m. "stranger;" *I*, m. "he," n. [G. Ed. p. 175.] "it;" Lith. *AWI*, f. "sheep," (Sansk. अवि *avi*, m. cf. *ovis*, ὄϊς); Goth. *ANSTI*, f. "mercy;" Lith. Goth. *SUNU*, m. "son;" Goth. *HANDU*, f. "hand;" Lith. *DARKU*, n. "ugly;" Goth. *FAIHU*, n. "beast;" Lith. *SUKANT*, m.† "turning; Goth. *FIYAND*, m. "foe;" Lith. *AKMEN*, m. "stone;" Goth. *AHMAN*, m. "spirit;" *NAMAN*, n. "name;" *BRŌTHAR*, m. "brother;" *DAUHTAR*, Lith. *DUKTER*, f. "daughter."

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vrika-s*,	*vĕhrkô*,‡	λύκο-ς,	*lupu-s*,	*wilka-s*,	*vulf's*.
m.	*ka-s*,	*kô*,‡	....	....	*ka-s*,	*hva-s*.

---

* In the comp. *wiess-pati-s*, "landlord"; isolated *pat-s*, "husband," with *i* in the nominative suppressed, as is the case in Gothic in all bases in *i*. Compare the Zend 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *vîs-paiti*, "lord of the region."

† These and other bases ending with a consonant are given only in those cases which have remained free from a subsequent vowel addition.

‡ Before the enclitic particle *cha*, as well here as in all other forms, the termination *as*, which otherwise becomes *ô* (§. 56^b.), retains the same form which, in Sanskrit also, अस् *as* assumes before च् *cha*: hence is said 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬀𐬯𐬗𐬀 *vĕhrkaścha*, "*lupusque*," as in Sanskrit वृकश्च *vrikaścha*. And the appended *cha* preserves the otherwise shortened final vowel in its original length: hence 𐬘𐬌𐬵𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬀 *jihvâcha*, "*linguaque*," 𐬠𐬎𐬱𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬙𐬍𐬗𐬀 *bushyaintîcha*, "*futuraque*," 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬁𐬗𐬀 *brâtâcha*, "*fraterque*" Even without the 𐬗𐬀 at times the original length of the final vowel is found undiminished: the principle of abbreviation, however, remains adequately proved, and I therefore observe it everywhere in the terminations.

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
n.	*dâna-m,*	*dâtĕ-m,*	δῶρο-ν,	*donum,*	*géra,*	*daur'.*
n.	*ta-t,*	*ta-ṭ,*	τό,	*is-tu-d,*	*ta-i,*	*tha-ta.*
f.	*jihwâ,*	*hizva,**	χώρα,	*terra,*	*rankà,*	*giba.*
f.	*kâ,*	*kâ,*	....	....	....	*hvô.*
m.	*pati-s,*	*paiti-s,*	πόσι-ς,	*hosti-s,*	*pati-s,*	*gast'-s.*
m.	.....	....	....	*i-s,*	....	*i-s.*
f.	*prîti-s,*	*âfrîti-s*	πόρτι-ς,	*siti-s,*	*awi-s,*	*anst'-s.*
n.	*vâri,*	*vairi,*	ἴδρι,	*mare,*	....	....
n.	.....	....	....	*i-d,*	....	*i-ta.*
f.	*bhavishyantî,*	*bûshyainti**	....	....	*búsenti,*	....
m.	*sûnu-s,*	*paśu-s,*	ἰχθύ-ς,	*pecu-s,*	*sunù-s,*	*sunu-s.*
f.	*tanu-s,*	*tanu-s,*	πίτυ-ς,	*socru-s,*	....	*handu-s.*
n.	*madhu,*	*madhu,*	μέθυ,	*pecu,*	*darkù,*	*faihu.*
f.	*vadhû-s,*	....	....	....	....	....
m. f.	*gâu-s,*†	*gâu-s,*‡	βοῦ-ς,	*bō-s,*	....	....
f.	*nâu-s,*	....	ναῦ-ς,	....	....	....
f.	*vâk,*	*vâc-s,*	ὄπ-ς,	*voc-s,*	....	....
m.	*bharan,*	*barañ-ś,*	φέρων,	*feren-s,*	*sukañ-s,*	*fiyand-s'*
m.	*âtmâ',*	*aśma,**	δαίμων,	*sermo',*	*akmů',*	*ahma'.*
n.	*nâma',*	*nâma',*	τάλαν,	*nomen,*	....	*namô'.*
m.	*bhrâtâ',*	*brâta',**	πατήρ,	*frater,*	....	*brôthar.*
f.	*duhitâ',*	*dughdha,*,*	θυγάτηρ,	*mater,*	*duktė,'*	*dauhtar.*
m.	*dâtâ,*	*dâta',**	δοτήρ,	*dator,*	....	....
n.	*vachas,*	*vachô,**	ἔπος,	*opus,*	....	....

[G. Ed. p. 176.]

ACCUSATIVE.

SINGULAR.

149. The character of the accusative is *m* in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin; in Greek *ν*, for the sake of euphony. In Lithuanian the old *m* has become still more weakened to

---

* See the marginal note marked (‡) on the foregoing page.

† Irregularly for गोस् *gô-s.*

‡ Or 𐬔𐬁𐬊𐬯 *gâos,* §. 33.

the dull re-echoing nasal, which in Sanskṛit is called Anu- [G. Ed. p. 177.] swâra, and which we, in both languages, express by ṅ (§. 10.). The German languages have, so early as the Gothic even, lost the accusative mark in substantives entirely, but in pronouns of the 3d person, as also in adjective bases ending with a vowel which follow their declension, they have hitherto retained it; still only in the masculine: the feminine nowhere exhibits an accusative character, and is, like its nominative, devoid of inflexion. The Gothic gives *na* instead of the old *m*; the High German, with more correctness, a simple *n*: hence, Gothic *blind-na*, "*cœcum*," Old High German *plinta-n*, Middle and Modern High German *blinde-n*.

150. Primary forms terminating with a consonant prefix to the case-sign *m* a short vowel, as otherwise the combination would be, in most cases, impossible: thus, in Sanskṛit *am*, in Zend and Latin *ĕm*, appears as the accusative termination*: of the Greek *αν*, which must originally have existed, the *ν* is, in the present condition of the language, lost: examples are given in §. 157.

151. Monosyllabic words in *î*, *û*, and *âu*, in Sanskṛit, like consonantal bases, give *am* in place of the mere *m*, as the accusative termination, probably in order in this way to become polysyllabic. Thus, भी *bhî*, "fear," and नौ *nâu*, "ship," form, not *bhî-m* and *nâu-m*, as the Greek *νâυ-ν* would

---

[*] From the bases 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘 *druj* and 𐬬𐬁𐬗 *vâch*, I find besides 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘𐬆𐬨 *drujĕm*, 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬆𐬨 *vâchĕm*, in the V. S.; also frequently 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘𐬌𐬨 *drujim*, 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬌𐬨 *vâchim*: and if these forms are genuine, which I scarcely doubt, they are to be thus explained—that the vowel which stands before *m* is only a means of conjunction for appending the *m*; for this purpose, however, the Zend uses, besides the 𐬆 *ĕ* mentioned at §. 30, not unfrequently 𐬌 *i*; *e.g* for 𐬛𐬀𐬛𐬆𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬍 *dadĕmahî*, occurs also 𐬛𐬀𐬛𐬌𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬍 *dadimahî*, and many similar forms; as 𐬎𐬯𐬌𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬍 *uś-i-mahî*, answering to the Sanskṛit उश्मस् *uśmas* (in the Vêdas उश्मसि *uśmasi*), "we will."

[G. Ed. p. 178.] lead us to expect, but भियम् *bhiy-am*, नावम् *nâv-am.* With this agree the Greek themes in *ευ*, since these give *ε-α*, from *εϝ-α*, for *ευ-ν*; *e.g.* *βασιλέ(ϝ)α*, for *βασιλευ-ν*. It is, however, wrong to regard the Latin *em* as the true, originally sole accusative termination, and for *lupu-m, hora-m, fruc-tum, diem*, to seek out an older form *lupo-em, hora-em, fructu-em, die-em.* That the simple nasal suffices to characterize the accusative, and that a precursory vowel was only added out of other necessary reasons, is proved by the history of our entire family of languages, and would be adequately established, without Sanskṛit and Zend, by the Greek, Lithuanian, and Gothic. The Latin *em* in the accusative third declension is of a double kind: in one case the *e* belongs to the base, and stands, as in innumerable cases, for *i*; so that *e-m*, of *igne-m* (Sanskṛit अग्निम् *agni-m*), corresponds to the Indian *i-m*, Zend *î-m*, Greek *ι-ν*, Lithuanian *i-ǹ*, Gothic *i-na* (from *ina*, "him"); but in the *em* of consonantal bases the *e* answers to the Indian *a*, to which it corresponds in many other cases also.

152. The Sanskṛit and Zend neuter bases in *a*, and those akin to them in Greek and Latin, as well as the two natural genders, give a nasal as the sign of the accusative, and introduce into the nominative also this character, which is less personal, less animated, and is hence appropriated to the accusative as well as to the nominative in the neuter: hence, Sansk. शयनम् *śayana-m*, Zend 𐬱𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬥𐬆𐬨 *śayanĕ-m*, "a bed"; so in Latin and Greek, *donu-m*, *δῶρο-ν*. All other bases, with but few exceptions, in Latin, remain in the nominative and accusative without any case character, and give the naked base, which in Latin, however, replaces a final *i* by the cognate *e*; thus, *marĕ* for *mari* corre- [G. Ed. p. 179.] sponds to the Sanskṛit वारि *vâri*, "water"; the Greek, like the Sanskṛit and Zend, leaves the *ι* unchanged —*ἴδρι-ς*, *ἴδρι*, as in Sanskṛit शुचिस् *śuchis*, शुचि *śuchi.* The following are examples of neuter *u* bases, which supply the

place both of nominative and accusative: in Sanskṛit मधु *madhu,* "honey," "wine," अश्रु *aśru,* "tear," स्वादु *swâdu,* "sweet"; in Zend 𐬬𐬊𐬵𐬎 *vôhu,* "wealth" (Sanskṛit वसु *vasu*); in Greek *μέθυ, δάκρυ, ἡδύ*; in Latin *pecu, genu.* The length of this *u* is unorganic, and has probably passed into the nominative, accusative, and vocative from the oblique cases, where the length is to be explained from the suppressed case terminations. With regard to the fact that final *u* is always long in Latin, there is perhaps a reason always at hand for this length: in the ablative, for example, the length of the originally short *u* is explicable as a compensation for the case sign which has been dropped, by which, too, the *ŏ* of the second declension becomes long. The original shortness of the *u* of the fourth declension is perceivable from the dat. pl. *ŭ-bus.* The Σ, in Greek words like *γένος, μένος, εὐγενές,* has been already explained at §. 128. as belonging to the base: the same is the case with the Latin *e* in neuters like *genus, corpus, gravius:* it is the other form of the *r* of the oblique cases, like *gener-is, corpor-is, gravior-is* (see §. 127.); and *corpus* appears akin to the Sanskṛit neuter of the same meaning, वपुस् *vapus,* gen. वपुषस् *vapu-ṣh-as* (see §. 19.), and would consequently have an *r* too much, or the Sanskṛit has lost one.* The Σ also of neuter bases in T, in *τετυφός, τέρας,* does not seem to me to be the case sign, but an exchange with T, which is not admissible at the end, but is either rejected (*μέλι, πρᾶγμα*) or exchanged [G. Ed. p. 180.] for a cognate Σ, as *πρός* from *προτί,* Sanskṛit प्रति *prati.*†

---

* Compare, in this respect, *brachium, βραχίων,* with बाहुस् *bâhu-s,* "arm"; *frango, ῥήγνυμι,* with भनज्मि *bhanajmi,* "I break," भञ्ज्मस् *bhanjmas,* "we break."

† With this view, which I have already developed in my treatise "On some Demonstrative Bases, and their connection with various Prepositions and Conjunctions" (Berlin, by Dümmler), pp. 4—6, corresponds, as to the essential points, what Hartung has since said on this

subject

In Latin it is to be regarded as inconsistent with the spirit of the language, that most adjective bases ending with a consonant retain the nominative sign *s* of the two natural genders in the neuter, and in this gender extend it also to the accusative, as if it belonged to the base, as *capac-s felic-s*, *soler(t)s*, *aman(t)s*. In general, in Latin, in consonantal bases, the perception of the distinction of gender is very much blunted, as, contrary to the principle followed by the Sanskṛit, Zend, Greek, and Gothic, the feminine is no longer distinguished from the masculine.

153. In Gothic substantives, as well neuter as masculine, the case sign *m* is wanting, and hence neuter bases in *a* stand on the same footing with the *i*, *u*, and consonantal bases of the cognate languages in that, in the nominative and accusative, they are devoid of all inflexion. Compare, with regard to the form of this case, *daur(a)* with द्वारम् *dwâram*, which has the same meaning. In Gothic there are no neuter substantives in *i*; on the other hand, the [G. Ed. p. 181.] substantive bases in *ya*, by suppression of the *a* in the nominative and accusative singular (cf. §. 135.), gain in these cases the semblance of *i* bases; *e.g.* from the base *REIKYA*, "rich" (Sanskṛit राज्य *râjya*, likewise neuter), comes, in the case mentioned, *reiki*, answering to the Sanskṛit राज्यम् *râjya-m*. The want of neuter *i* bases

---

subject in his valuable work on "On the Cases," p. 152, &c.; where also the ρ of ἧπαρ and ὕδωρ is explained as coming from Τ, through the intervention of Σ. The Sanskṛit, however, appears to attribute a different origin to the ρ of these forms. To यकृत् *yakṛit* "liver" (likewise neuter), corresponds both *jecur* and ἧπαρ, through the common interchange between *k* and *p*: both owe to it their ρ, as ἥπατ-ος does its τ. Ἧπατ-ος should be ἥπαρτ-ος, Sanskṛit यकृतस् *yakṛit-as*. But the Sanskṛit also in this word, in the weak cases, can give up the *r*, but then irregularly substitutes न् *n* for त् *t*, *e.g.* gen. यक्नस् *yakn-as* for यकनस् *yakanas*. With regard to the ρ of ὕδωρ, compare उद्र *udra*, "water," in समुद्र *sam-udra*, "sea."

in German is the less surprising, that in the cognate Sanskṛit, Zend, and Greek, the corresponding termination in the neuter is not very common. Of neuter *u* roots the substantive declension has preserved only the single *FAIHU*, "beast." In Lithuanian the neuter in substantives is entirely lost, and has left traces only in pronouns and adjectives, where the latter relate to pronouns. Adjective bases in *u*, in this case, have their nominative and accusative singular in accordance with the cognate languages, without case sign; *e.g. darkù*, "ugly," corresponds as nominative and accusative neuter to the masculine nominative *darkù-s*, accusative *darku-ṅ*. This analogy, however, is followed in Lithuanian, by the adjective bases in *a* also; and thus *géra*, "good," corresponds as nominative and accusative to the masculine forms *géra-s*, *géra-ṅ*,* which are provided with the sign of the case.

[G. Ed. p, 182.] 154. It is a question whether the *m*, as the sign of the nominative and accusative neuter (it is excluded from the vocative in Sanskṛit and Zend), was originally limited simply to the *a* bases, and was not joined to the

---

* The *e* of neuter forms like *dide*, "great," from the base *DIDỴA*—nom. masc. *didi-s* for *didỵa-s*, as §. 135.* *ỵaunikkis*, "youngling"—I explain through the euphonic influence of the suppressed *ỵ*. As also the feminine originally long *a* is changed into *e* by the same influence, so is the nominative and accusative neuter in such words identical with the nominative feminine, which is likewise, according to §. 137, devoid of inflexion; and *dide* therefore signifies also "*magna*," and answers, as feminine, very remarkably to the Zend nominatives explained at §. 137., as 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬉 *pĕrĕnê*, 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬎𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬉 *brâturyê*. In this sense are to be regarded, also, the feminine substantives in Ruhig's third declension, as far as they terminate in the nominative in *e*, as *giesme*, "song." As no masculine forms in *is* correspond to them, the discovery of the true nature of these words becomes more difficult; for the lost *y* or *i* has been preserved only in the genitive plural, where *giesmỵ-û* is to be taken like *rank-û* from *rankà*, *i.e.* the final vowel of the bases is suppressed before the termination, or has been melted down with it.

i and *u* bases also; so that, in Sanskṛit, for *vâri* we had originally *vâri-m*, for *madhu*, *madhu-m?* I should not wish to deny the original existence of such forms; for why should the *a* bases alone have felt the necessity of not leaving the nominative and accusative neuter without a sign of relation or of personality? It is more probable that the *a* bases adhered only the more firmly to the termination once assumed, because they are by far the most numerous, and could thus present a stronger opposition to the destructive influence of time by means of the greater force of their analogies; in the same way as the verb substantive, in like manner, on account of its frequent use, has allowed the old inflexion to pass less into oblivion, and in German has continued to our time several of the progeny of the oldest period; as, for instance, the nasal, as characteristic of the 1st person in *bi-n*, Old High German *pi-m* Sans. भवामि *bhavâ-mi*. In Sanskṛit, one example of an *m* as the nominative and accusative sign of an *i* base is not wanting, although it stands quite isolated; and indeed this form occurs in the pronominal declension, which everywhere remains longest true to the traditions of bygone ages. I mean the interrogative form किम् *ki-m*, "what"? from the base कि *ki*, which may perhaps, in Sanskṛit, have produced a *ki-t*, which is contained in the Latin *qui-d*, and which I recognise again, also, in the enclitic चित् *chit*, weakened from कित् *ki-t*. Otherwise *i* or *u*-bases of pronouns in the nominative accusative neuter do not occur; for अमु *amu*, "that" (man), substitutes अदस् *adas;* and इ *i*, "this," combines with [G. Ed. p. 183.] दम् *dam* (इदम् *idam*, "this"). Concerning the original procedure of consonantal bases in the nominative and accusative neuters no explanation is afforded by the pronominal declension, as all primary forms of pronouns terminate in vowels, and, indeed, for the most part, in *a*.

155. Pronominal bases in *a* in Sanskṛit give *t*, in Zend *ṭ*, as the inflexion of the nominative and accusative neuter. The

Gothic gives, as in the accusative masculine, *na* for *m* or *n*, so here *ta* for simple *t*; and transfers these, like other peculiarities of the pronominal declension, as in the other German dialects, also to the adjective *a* bases; *e.g.* *blinda-ta*, "*cœcum*," *midya-ta*, "*medium*." The High German gives, in the older period, *z* instead of the Gothic *t* (§. 87.), in the most modern period, *s*. The pronominal base *I* (later *E*) follows in German, as in Latin, the analogy of the old *a* bases, and the Latin gives, as in the old ablative, *d* instead of *t*. The Greek must abandon all *T* sounds at the end of words: the difference of the pronominal from the common *o* declension consists, therefore, in this respect, merely in the absence of all inflexion. From this difference, however, and the testimony of the cognate languages, it is perceived that *τό* was originally sounded *τοτ* or *τοδ*, for a *τον* would have remained unaltered, as in the masculine accusative. Perhaps we have a remnant of a neuter-inflexion *τ* in *ὅττι*; so that we ought to divide *ὅτ-τι*; and therefore the double *τ*, in this form, would no more have a mere metrical foundation, than the double *σ* (§. 128.) in *ὄρεσ-σι*. (Buttmann, p. 85.)

156. We find the origin of the neuter case-sign *t* in the pronominal base त *ta*, "he," "this," (Greek TO, Goth, *THA*, &c.); and a convincing proof of the correctness of this explanation is this, that तत् *ta-t* "it" "this," stands, in regard to the base, in the same contrast with स *sa*, "he," सा *sâ*, "she," as *t*, as the neuter case-sign, does to [G. Ed. p. 184.] the nominative *s* of masculine and feminine nouns (§. 134.). The *m* of the accusative also is, I doubt not, of pronominal origin; and it is remarkable that the compound pronouns *i-ma*, "this," and *a-mu*, "that," occur just as little as *ta* in the nominative masculine and feminine; but the Sanskṛit substitutes for the base *amu*, in the nominative masculine and feminine singular the form *asâu*, the *s* of which, therefore, stands in the same relation to the *m* of अमुम् *amu-m*, "*illum*," अमुष्य *amu-ṣhya*, "*illius*," and other oblique cases, as, among

the case-terminations, the sign of the masculine feminine nominative to the *m* of the accusative and neuter nominative. Moreover, in Zend is used 𐬌𐬨𐬀𐬝 *imaṭ*, "this," (n.) (nom. accus.), but not *imô*, "this" (m.), but 𐬀𐬉𐬨 *aêm* (from अयम् *ayam*), and 𐬍𐬨 *îm* (from इयम् *iyam*), "this" (f.). Observe in Greek the pronominal base MI, which occurs only in the accusative, and, in regard to its vowel, has the same relation to म *ma* (in the compounded base इम *i-ma*) that किम् *ki-m* "what?" has to कस् *ka-s* "who"? The Gothic neut. termination *ta* anwers, in respect to the transposition of sound (§. 87.), to the Latin *d* (*id*, *istud*): this Latin *d*, however, seems to me a descent from the older *t*; as, *e.g.*, the *b* of *ab* has proceeded from the *p* of the cognate अप *apa*, ἀπό; and in Zend the *d* of 𐬁𐬛𐬆𐬨* *â-dĕm*, "him," is clearly only a weakening of the *t* of त *ta*, 𐬙𐬀 *ta*.†

[G. Ed. p. 185.] 157. To the Sanskṛit *ta-t*, mentioned above, Zend *ta-ṭ*, Greek τό, &c., corresponds a Lithuanian *tai*, "the," as the nominative and accusative singular. I do not believe, however, that the *i* which is here incorporated in the base *TA* is any way connected with the neuter *t*, *d*, of the cognate languages: I should rather turn to a relationship with the *ί* demonstrative in the Greek (*οὑτοσί*, *ἐκεινοσί*), and to the इत् *it*, which is, in like manner, used enclitically in the Vêdas—a petrified neuter, which is no longer conscious of any gender or case; and hence, in several cases, combining with masculine pronouns of the third person.* This इत् *it*, is consequently the sister form of the Latin *id* and Gothic *i-ta*, which, in the Greek *ἐκεινοσί*, has, perhaps only from necessity, dropped the *τ* or *δ*, and which already, ere I was acquainted with the Vêda-dialect, I represented as a consistent part of the conjunctions चेत् *chêt* (from *cha* + *it*), "if," and नेत् *nêt* (*na* + *it*). [G. Ed. p. 186.]

---

* The *â* of *â-dĕm* is the preposition corresponding to the Sansk. *â*.

† See my treatise "On the Origin of the Cases" in the Trans. of the Berlin Academy for the year 1826. As Τ in Greek easily becomes Σ (but a final Σ has in many parts of Grammar become ν), Hartung founds on this, in the pamphlet before mentioned, p. 154, the acute conjecture of an original identity of neuters in ν (*m*) with those in *t*. We cannot, however, agree with him in this, because the *m*, on account of the origin which we ascribe to this case-sign, is as little surprising in the nominative of the neuter as in the accusative of the more animated genders; and besides, a greater antiquity is proved to belong to the neuter *m*, through the Sanskṛit and Zend, than probably the ν sounds can boast, which, in Greek, stand for an older Σ, as μεν for μες (मस् *mas*), and in the dual τον, τον for थस् *thas*, तस् *tas*. What is wanting in the Greek, viz. a neuter inflexion *s*, appears, however, to be possessed by the Sanskṛit; and I am inclined to divide the form अदस् *adas*, "that" (nom. accus.) into *a-da-s*, and to explain it as a corruption of *a-da-t* (cf. Gramm. Crit. Addend. to r. 299.); but to regard the syllable *da* as weakened from *ta*, as in the Zend 𐬁𐬛𐬆𐬨 *â-dĕ-m*, "him." We shall recur to this when treating of the pronouns.

The words mentioned at §. 148. form in the accusative:

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vṛika-m*,	*vĕhrkĕ-m*,	*λύκο-ν*,	*lupu-m*,	*wilka-ṅ*,	*vulf'*.
m.	*ka-m*,	*kĕ-m*,	....	....	*ka-ṅ*,	*hwa-na*.
n.	*dâna-m*,	*dâtĕ-m*,	*δῶρο-ν*,	*donu-m*,	*géra*,	*daur'*.
n.	*ta-t*,	*ta-ṭ*,	*τό*,	*is-tu-d*,	*ta-i*,	*tha-ta*.
f.	*jihwâ-m*,	*hizva-ṅm*,	*χώρα-ν*,	*terram*,	*ranka-ṅ*,	*giba*.
f.	*kâ-m*,	*ka-ṅm*,	....	....	...,.	*hvô*.†

---

* Examples are given by Rosen in his Vêda Specimen, pp. 24, 25, which, though short, are in the highest degree interesting for Sanskṛit and comparative Grammar; as, सइत् *saït*, "he," तमित् *tamit*, "him"; तयोरित् *tayôrit*, "of these two"; तस्माइत् *tasmâït*, "to him"; अस्माइत् *asmâït*, "to this" (m.). The Zend combines in the same way 𐬉 *e* or 𐬌 *i* with the interrogative: 𐬐𐬀𐬯𐬉 *kaśê* and 𐬐𐬀𐬯𐬌 *kaśi*, "who"? occur frequently. Perhaps only one of the two modes of writing is correct. Cf. Gramm. Crit. Addend. to r. 270.

† One would expect *hvô-na*, or, with abbreviation of the base, *hva-na*, which would be the same as the masculine. With regard to the lost case-termination, it may be observed, that, in general, the feminines are less constant in handing down the old inflexions. A charge which is incurred by the Sanskṛit in the nominative, since it gives *kâ* for *kâ-s** (§. 137.), is incurred by the Gothic (for in this manner the corruption spreads) in the accusative also.

---

* Cf. §. 386. p. 544.

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*pati-m,*	*paitî-m,*	πόσι-ν,	*hostem,*	*páti-ṅ,*	*gast'.*
m.	....	....	....	....	....	*i-na.*
f.	*prîti-m,*	*âfrîtî-m,*	πόρτι-ν,	*siti-m,*	*áwi-ṅ,*	*anst'.*
n.	*vâri,*	*vairi,*	ἴδρι,	*mare,*	....	...
n.	....	....	....	*i-d,*	....	*i-ta.*
f.	*bhavishyantîm,*	*bûshyaintî-m,*	....	....	....*	...
m.	*sûnu-m,*	*paśû-m,*	ἰχθύ-ν,	*pecu-m,*	*sunu-ṅ,*	*sunu.*
f.	*tanu-m,*	*tanû-m,*	πίτυ-ν,	*socru-m,*	....	*handu.*
n.	*madhu,*	*madhu,*	μέθυ,	*pecu,*	*darkù,*	*faihu.*
f.	*vadhû-m,*	....	....	....	....	....
m.f.	*gâ-m,*†	*ga-ṅm,*†	βοῦ-ν,	*bov-em,*	....	....
f.	*nâv-am,*	....	ναῦ-ν,	....	....	....
f.	*vâch-am,*	*vâch-ĕm,*	ὄπ-α,	*voc-em,*	....	....

[G. Ed. p. 187.]

---

* The feminine participial bases in *i*, mentioned at §. 119., remain free from foreign commixture only in the nominative and vocative singular: in all other cases, to the old *i* is further added a more modern *a*; and the declension then follows *RANKA* exactly; only that in some cases, through the euphonic influence of the *i*, and in analogy with the Zend and the Latin fifth declension (§. 137.), the added *a* becomes, or may become, *e*: in the latter case the *i* is suppressed, as l. c. 𐬐𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬉 *kainê* for *kainyê* (§. 42.). Thus, from *sukanti*, "the turning" (f.), *sukusi*, "the having turned" (f.), and *suksenti*, "the about to turn," Mielcke gives the accusatives *sukanczeṅ* (see. p. 138, Note) or *sukancziaṅ*, *sukuseṅ*, and *suksenczeṅ* or *suksencziaṅ*. And even if, according to Ruhig (by Mielcke, pp. 3, 4), the *i* before *a, e, o, u* is scarcely heard, it must not therefore, in this case, as well as in those there enumerated, be the less regarded as etymologically present, and it was originally pronounced so as to be fully audible. From the feminine, where the *i*, as Sanskṛit grammar shews, has an original position, this vowel appears to have made its way, in Lithuanian participial bases, into the oblique cases of the masculine, and to be here invested with a short masculine *a*. The accusative *sukanti-ṅ*, "the turning" (masc.), is therefore to be regarded in the same light as *yaunikki-ṅ*, from the theme *ỴAUNIKỴA*, *i.e.* it stands for *sukantyi-ṅ* from *sukantya-ṅ*, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬍𐬨 *tûirî-m* for *tûiryĕm* (§. 42.), and to the Gothic, like *hari* from the base *HARỴA* (§. 135.).

† See §. 122.

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*bharant-am,*	*barĕnt-em,*	φέροντ-α,	*ferent-em,*	....	*fiyand.*
m.	*âtmân-am,*	*aśman-ĕm,*	δαίμον-α,	*sermon-em,*	....	*ahman.*
n.	*nâma',*	*nâma',*	τάλαν,	*nomen,*	....	*namô.*
m.	*bhrâtar-am,*	*brâtar-ĕm,*	πατέρ-α,	*fratr-em,*	....	*brôthar.*
f.	*duhitar-am,*	*dughdhar-ĕm,*	θυγατέρ-α,	*matr-em,*	....	*dauhtar.*
m.	*dâtâr-am,*	*dâtâr-ĕm,*	δοτῆρ-α,	*datōr-em,*	....	....
n.	*vachas,*	*vachô,**	ἔπος,	*opus,*	....	....

INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE.

158. The instrumental is denoted in Sanskṛit by आ *â*; and this inflexion is, in my opinion, a [G. Ed. p. 188.] lengthening of the pronominal base अ *a*, and identical with the preposition आ *â*, "to," "towards," "up to," which springs from this pronoun, and appears only as a prefix. The Zend *â* appears still more decidedly in its pronominal nature in the compound mentioned at §. 156. Note *, 𐬁𐬛𐬆𐬨 *â-dĕm*, "him," "this," (m.) fem. 𐬁𐬛𐬄𐬨 *â-daṅm*. As a case-sign, 𐬁 *â* generally appears abbreviated (see p. 163. Note ‡), even where this termination has been melted into one with a preceding 𐬀 *a* of the base; so that in this case the primary form and the instrumental are completely similar; *e.g.* 𐬰𐬀𐬊𐬱𐬀 *zaôsha,* "voluntarily," 𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬊𐬱𐬀 *azaôsha,* "involuntarily," (V. S. p. 12.) 𐬯𐬐𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬊𐬚𐬥𐬀 *skyaôthna,* "*actione,*" often occur; 𐬀𐬥𐬀 *ana,* "through this" (m.), 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬀 *paiti-bĕrĕta,* "*allevato.*"† The long *â* appears in the instrumental only in monosyllabic bases in 𐬀 *a*; thus 𐬓𐬁 *khâ,* "*proprio*" V. S. p. 46.), from the base 𐬓𐬀 *kha* (Sanskṛit स्व *swa,* §. 35.). In Sanskṛit a euphonic न् *n* is added to bases ending with short vowels in the masc.

---

* See §. 56^{b}.

† Cf. Gramm. Crit. r. 638. Rem. This interesting instrumental form was not known by Rask when he published his work on the Zend, and it was not easy to discover it, on account of its discrepancy from the Sanskṛit and the many other forms with final 𐬀 *a*.

and neut. genders;* a final अ *a*, however, is, as in several other cases, changed into ए *ê;* and the आ *â* of the case-suffix is shortened, as it appears to me, by the influence of this clog of the base; as वृकेण *vrikê-ṇ-a*, but अग्निना *agni-n-â*, वारिणा *vâri-ṇ-â*, सूनुना *sûnu-n-â*, मधुना *madhu-n-â*, from वृक *vrika*, &c. The Vêdas, however, exhibit further remains of formations without the euphonic *n*, as स्वप्नया *swapnay-â* for स्वप्नेन *swapnê-n-a* from स्वप्न *swapna*, m. "sleep" (see §. 133.); उरुया *uru-y-â* for उरुणा *uru-ṇ-a*, from उरु *uru*, "great," with a euphonic य् *y* (§. 43.); प्रबाहवा *prabâhav-â*, from प्रबाहु *prabâhu*, from बाहु *bâhu*, "arm," with the preposition [G. Ed. p. 189.] प्र *pra*. The Vêda-form स्वप्नया *swapnayâ*, finds analogies in the common dialect in मया *mayâ*, "through me," and त्वया *twayâ*, "through thee," from the bases *ma* and *twa*, the *a* of which in this case, as in the loc., passes into *ê*. And from पति *pati*, m. "Lord," and सखि *sakhi*, m. "friend," the common dialect forms instrumentals without the interposition of न् *n*, viz. पत्या *paty-â*, सख्या *sakhy-â*. Feminines never admit a euphonic *n*; but *â*, as before some other vowel terminations, passes into ए *ê*, that is to say, *i* is blended with it, and it is shortened to अ *a*; hence, जिह्वया *jihway-â* (from *jihwê* + *â*). The Zend follows in this the analogy of the Sanskrit.

159. As *ê* in Gothic, according to §. 69., just like *ô*, represents आ *â*, so the forms *thê*, *hvê*, which Grimm (pp. 790. and 798.) regards as instrumentals, from the demonstrative base *THA* and the interrogative *HVA*, correspond very remarkably to the Zend instrumentals, as 𐬑𐬁 *khâ* from the base 𐬑𐬀 *kha*. We must, however, place also *svê* in the class of genuine Zend instrumental forms, which have been correctly preserved: besides *svê* from *SVA* is also,

---

* The original has "Stämmen gen. masc. und fem.;" but genitives of nouns in *a* do not take a euphonic *n*, nor do feminine nouns ending in short vowels use such an augment in the instrumental: here is no doubt some typographic error.—*Editor*.

in respect of its base, akin to 𐬑𐬁 *khâ* from *kha* (§. 35.).* The meaning of *svê* is "as" (ὡς), and the *sô*, which has arisen in High German from *sva* or *svê*, means both "as" and "so," &c. The case relations, however, which are expressed by "as" and "so" are genuine instrumentals.† [G. Ed. p. 190.] The Anglo-Saxon form for *svê* is *svâ*, in which the colouring of the Zend 𐬑𐬁 *khâ* is most truly preserved. The Gothic *sva*, "so," is, according to its form, only the abbreviation of *svê*, as *a* is the short equivalent both of *ê* and of *ô*: through this abbreviation, however, *sva* has become identical with its theme, just as 𐬀𐬥𐬀 *ana* in Zend is, according to §. 158., not distinguished from its theme.

160. ‡As the dative in Gothic and in Old High German very frequently expresses the instrumental relation, and the termination also of the dative is identical with the Sanskrit-Zend instrumental character, shortened only, as in polysyllabic words in Zend, it may be proper here to describe at the same time the formation of the German dative. In *a* bases it is in Gothic, as in Zend, identical with the theme, and from *VULFA* comes *vulfa*, as 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬀 *vĕhrka* from *VEHRKA*. Moreover, there are some other remarkable datives, which have preserved their due length, and answer to the monosyllabic instrumentals *thê*, *vê*, *svê*, which have been already explained, viz. *hvammê-h*, *hvar-yammê-h*, "*cuique*," and *ainummê-hun*, "*ulli*," for *ainammê-*

---

* Grimm's conjectures regarding the forms *sva* and *svê* (III. 43.) appear to me untenable; and an explanation of these forms, without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend, is impossible. More regarding this at the pronouns.

† If "as" is regarded as "through which means, in which manner or way," and "so" as "through this means, in this way," it is certain that among the eight cases of the Sanskrit language there is none which would be adapted in the relative and demonstrative to express "as" and "so."

‡ The German dat. sing. is, according to §. 356. Rem. 3., to be everywhere identified with the Sanskrit dative; and so, too, the dat. pl. the *m* of which approaches as closely to the Sansk. *bhyas*, Latin *bus*, Lith. *mus*, as the instrumental termination *bhis*, Lith. *mis*.

hun (§. 66.).* Bases in *i* reject this vowel before the case-sign; hence *gast-a* for *gasti-a:* on the other hand, in the *u* bases the termination is suppressed, and the base-vowel receives the Guna: hence *sunau*, which will have been pronounced originally *su-nav-a* ; so that, after suppressing the termination, the *v* has again returned to its original vowel nature. The form *sunav-a* would answer to the Vêda form प्रबाहवा *pra-bâhav-â*. In Zend, the bases which terminate with 𐬌 *i* and 𐬎 *u*, both in the instrumental and before most [G. Ed. p. 191.] of the other vowel terminations, assume Guna or not at pleasure. Thus we find in the Vend. S. p. 469, 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬀𐬬𐬀 *bâzav-a*, "*brachio*," as analogous to प्रबाहवा *pra-bâhav-â* (§. 57.); on the other hand, p. 408, 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬬𐬀 *zanthwa* from *zantu*, "the slaying," "killing." From 𐬞𐬀𐬥𐬱𐬥𐬎 *panśnu*, "dust," we find, l. c. p. 229, the form 𐬞𐬀𐬥𐬱𐬥𐬏 *panśnû*, which Anquetil translates by "*par cette poussiere*"; and if the reading is correct, then *panśnû*, in regard of the suppressed termination (compensation for which is made by lengthening the base vowel), would answer to the Gothic *sunau*.

161. Bases ending with a consonant have lost, in German, the dative character: hence, in Gothic, *fiyand*, *ahmin*, *brôthr* (§. 132.), for *fiyand-a*, *ahmin-a*, *brôthr-a*.† All feminines, too, must be pronounced to have lost the dative sign, paradoxical as it may appear to assert that the Gothic *gibai*, "*dono*," and *thizai*, "*huic*," *izai*, "*ei*," do not contain any dative inflexion, while we formerly believed the *ai* of *gibai* to be connected with the Sanskrit feminine dative

---

* Here the appended particle has preserved the original length of the termination, as is the case in Zend in all instrumentals, if they are combined with 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, "and."

† The Old High German form *fatere* (for *fatera*), "*patri*," proceeds, as do the genitive *fatere-s*, and the accusative *fatera-n*, from a theme *FATERA*, extended by *a*. The accusative *fatera-n*, however, is remarkable, because substantives, so early as in the Gothic, have lost the accusative sign, together with the final vowel of the base. In Old High German a few other substantives and proper names follow the analogy of *FATERA*.

character ऐ *âi.* But as we have recognised in the masculine and neuter dative the Indo-Zend instrumental, we could not, except from the most urgent necessity, betake ourselves to the Sanskṛit dative for explanation of the Gothic feminine dative. This necessity, however, does not exist, for, *e.g.*, *hveitai*, "*albae*," from *HVEITŌ* from *HVEITĀ*, may be deduced from the instrumental श्वेतया *śwêtay-â*, "*albâ*," from श्वेता *śwêtâ*, by suppressing the termination, and changing the semi-vowel to a vowel in the same manner as, above, *sunau* from *sunav-a*, [G. Ed. p. 192.] or as the fem. *handau*, "*manui*," from *handav-a*. Analogous with *sunau*, *handau*, are also the dative feminine *i* bases; and, *e.g.*, *anstai*, "*gratiæ*," has the same relation to its theme *ANSTI* that *handau* has to *HANDU*.

162. In Old High German the forms *diu*, *hviu*, correspond to the Gothic instrumentals *thê*, *hvê*; but authorities differ as to the mode of writing them,* regarding which we shall say more under the pronouns. The form *hiu*, also, from a demonstrative base *HI*, has been preserved in the compound *hiutu* for *hiu-tagu*, "on this day," "to-day" (see Grimm, p. 794), although the meaning is here properly locative. The Gothic has for it the dative *himma-daga*. This termination *u* has maintained itself also in substantive and adjective bases masc. neut. in *a* and *i*, although it is only sparingly used, and principally after the preposition *mit* (see Graff, l. c. pp. 110, 111); *mit wortu*, "with a word," from *WORTA*; *mit cuatu*, "with good," from *CUATA*; *mit kastu*, "with a guest," from *KASTI*. It is here important to remark, that the instrumental in Sanskṛit very frequently expresses, *per se*, the sociative relation. We cannot, however, for this reason look upon this *u* case as generically different from the common dative, which, we have already remarked, is likewise of instrumental origin

---

* With reference to their use with various prepositions we refer our readers to Graff's excellent treatise, "The Old High German Prepositions," p. 181, &c.

and meaning: we rather regard the *u** as a corruption [G. Ed. p. 193.] (although one of very ancient date) of *u*, just as in the neuter plural of pronouns and adjectives a *u* corresponds to the short *a* of the Gothic and the older cognate languages. In Lithuanian the *a* bases form their instrumental in *ù*, which is long, and in which the final vowel of the base has been melted down. That this *ù*, also, has arisen from a long *a*, and thus, *e.g.* *diewù* is akin to the Zend 𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬎𐬎𐬀 *daêva*, "*deo*," for 𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬎𐬎𐬁 *daêvâ*, appears to me the less doubtful, as also in the plural *diewais* answers very surprisingly to 𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬎𐬎𐬁𐬌𐬱 *daêvâis*, देवैस् *dêvâis*. Moreover, in many other parts of grammar, also, the Lithuanian *ù* corresponds to the Sanskrit आ *â*; *e.g.* in the plural genitive. In feminine *a* bases, also, in Lithuanian, the vowel of the base is melted down with that of the termination, but its quality is not changed; as, *e.g.* *rankà* "*manu*," from *RANKĀ*. In all other bases *mi* stands as the termination, to which the plural instrumental termination *mis* has the same relation as, in Latin, *bis* to *bi* (*voBIS*, *tiBI*); and, according to §. 63., I do not doubt that in both numbers the *m* has arisen from *b*.

163. The bases given in §. 148. form, in the instrumental and in the Gothic, in the dative,

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	LITHUANIAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vṛikê-ṇ-a*,	*vĕhrka*,	*wilkù*,	*vulfa*.
f.	*jihway-â*.	*hizvay-a*,	*rankà*,	*gibai*.
m.	*paty-â*,	*paithy-a*,	*pati-mi*,	*gast'-a*.

---

* Contrary to Grimm's opinion, I cannot let the instrumental *u* pass as long, even not to notice its derivation from a short *a*; for, first, it appears, according to Notker, in the pronominal forms *diu*, &c. without a circumflex (other instrumentals of the kind do not occur in his works); secondly, like the short *a*, it is exchanged for *o* (§. 77.); hence, *wio*, *wëo*, with *wiu*, *wio-lih*, *huëo-lih*, "*qualis*" (properly, "similar to whom"); thirdly, the length of this *u* cannot be deduced from the Gothic forms *thê*, *hvê*, *svê*, because these, in all probability, owe the retention of their long vowel to their being monosyllabic (cf. §. 137.).

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	LITHUANIAN.	GOTHIC.
f.	*prîty-â,*	*âfrîthy-a,*	*awi-mi,*	*anstai.*
f.	*bhavishyanty-â,*	*bûshyainty-a,*	....	....
m.	*sûnu-n-â,*	*pasv-a,*	*sunu-mi,*	*sunau.*
f.	*tanw-â,*	*tanv-a,*	....	*handau.*
f.	*vadhw-â,*	....	....	....
m. f.	*gav-â.*	*gav-a,*	....	....
f.	*nâv-â,*	....	....	....
f.	*vâch-â,*	*vâch-a,*	....	....
m.	*bharat-â,*	*barĕnt-a,*	....	*fiyand.*
m.	*âtman-â,*	*asman-a,*	....	*ahmin.*
n.	*nâmn-â,*	*nâman-a,*	....	*namin.*
m.	*bhrâtr-â,*	*brâthr-a,*	....	*brôthr.*
f.	*duhitr-â,*	*dughdhĕr-a,*	....	*dauhtr.*
m.	*dâtr-â,*	*dâthr-a,*	....	....
n.	*vachas-â,*	*vacanh-a,*	....	....

[G. Ed. p. 194.]

164. In Sanskrit and Zend, *ê* is the sign of the dative, which, I have scarce any doubt, originally belongs to the demonstrative base *ê*, whence the nom. अयम् *ayam* (from *ê*+*am*), "this"; which, however, as it appears, is itself only an extension of the base अ *a*, from which arise most of the cases of this pronoun (*a-smâi, a-smât, a-smin,* &c.); and regarding which it is to be observed, that the common *a* bases, also, in Sanskrit in many cases extend this vowel to *ê* by the admixture of an *i* (§. 2.). The dative sign consequently would, in its origin, be most intimately connected with the case, which, as (§. 160.) was explained, denotes, in German, both the dative and instrumental relation, and occurs in Zend also with a dative signification.*

---

* *E.g.* Vend. S. p. 45: [illegible] *Haômô azîzânâitibis dadhâiti csaitô-puthrîm,* "Hóm gives a splendid daughter to those who have not had offspring." The lithographed Codex, however, gives the form *azîzânâitibis* as three words, [illegible]

[G. Ed. p. 195.] We have here further to remark, that in the pronoun of the 2d person the affix भ्यम् *bhyam* (from *bhi* + *am*) in तुभ्यम् *tu-bhyam*, "to thee," stands in evident relationship to the instrumental भिस् *bhis* in the plural. The feminine bases in *â*, *î*, *û*, and, at will also, those in *i* and *u*, prolong in Sanskṛit the dative termination ए *ê* to ऐ *âi*; with the final *â* of the base an *i* is blended; hence जिह्वायै *jihwây-âi* from *jivâi-âi*. On the other hand, इ *i* and उ *u* receive the Guna augment before ए *ê*, but not before the broader ऐ *âi*; as सूनवे *sûnav-ê* from *sûnu*. In Zend, feminine *â* and *î*-bases, like the Sanskṛit, have *âi* for their termination: however, *hizvây-âi* is not used, but 𐬵𐬌𐬰𐬬𐬀𐬫𐬁𐬌 *hizvay-âi*, from the base *hizvâ*, as long vowels in the penultimate, in polysyllabic bases, are so frequently shortened. Bases in 𐬌 *i* have, in combination with the particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, preserved the Sanskṛit form most truly, and exhibit, without exception in this case, the form 𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬉𐬗𐬀 *ay-aê-cha* (see §. 28), *e.g.* 𐬐𐬀𐬭𐬱𐬙𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬉𐬗𐬀 *karstayaêcha*, "and on account of the ploughing," "in order to plough" (Vend. S. p. 198), [G. Ed. p. 196.] from *karste*. Without *cha*, however, the form 𐬈𐬉 *eê* is almost the sole one that occurs, *e.g.* 𐬑𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬈𐬉 *kharĕteê*, "in order to eat," from 𐬑𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬌 *kharĕti*. This form, I doubt not, has arisen from 𐬀𐬫𐬉 *ay-ê*, by rejecting the semi-vowel, after which the preceding 𐬀 *a* has become 𐬈 *e* (§. 31.). Forms like 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬉 *âfrîtê** or 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬈 *âfrîte*, which sometimes occur, and are most corrupted, may

---

𐬀𐬰𐬍 𐬰𐬁𐬥𐬁𐬌𐬙𐬌 𐬠𐬌𐬯 *azî zânâiti bis*. Such separations in the middle of a word are, however, in this Codex, quite common. I entertain no doubt of the correctness of the length of the *a*, both of *zâ* and *nâi*; and I anticipate a variety *azîzanaitibis* or—*bis*. Probably also *csaêtô* is to be read for *csaitô*. Anquetil translates: "O Hom, donnez à la femme, qui n'a pas encore engendré, beaucoup d'enfans brillans." We will return to this passage hereafter; and we will here further remark that, at the same page of the Vend. S., the instr. 𐬀𐬉𐬠𐬌𐬯 *aêbis* also occurs in the sense of "to them."

* Cf. p. 286 Note †.

rest on errors in writing.* Bases in *u* may take Guna; *e.g.* 𐬬𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬉 *vaṇ-hav-ê* from 𐬬𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬎 *vaṇhu*, "pure"; or not, as 𐬭𐬀𐬚𐬎𐬎𐬉 *rathv-ê* from 𐬭𐬀𐬙𐬎 *ratu*, "great," "lord." The form without Guna is the more common. A euphonic 𐬌𐬌 *y* also is found interposed between the base and the termination (§. 43.) *e.g.* 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎𐬌𐬌𐬉 *tanu-y-ê*, "*corpori*."

165. Bases in अ *a* add to the case-sign *ê* also an अ *a*; but from ए *ê* (= *a* + *i*) and *a* is formed अय *aya;* and this, with the *a* of the base, gives *âya*, thus वृकाय *vṛikâya*. Hence may have arisen, by suppressing the final *a*, the Zendian 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬁𐬌 *vĕhrkâi*, after which the preceding semi-vowel must return to its vowel nature. It might, however, be assumed, that the Zend has never added an *a* to the dative *ê*, and that this is a later appearance in Sanskṛit, which arose after the division of languages; for from *a* + *ê* is formed, quite regularly, *âi* (§. 2.). The Sanskṛit forms also, from the particle स्म *sma*, which is added to pronouns of the 3d person, the dative स्मै *smâi;* and thus, *e.g.* कस्मै *kasmâi*, "to whom"? answers to the Zend 𐬐𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬁𐬌 *kahmâi*. The Sanskṛit, in this case, abstains from adding the अ *a*, which is elsewhere appended to the dative ए *ê*; since स्म *sma*, already encumbered with the preceding principal pronoun, cannot admit any superfluity in its termination, and for this reason gives up its radical अ *a* before the termination इन् *in* in the locative case also, and forms *sm'-in* for *smên*. [G. Ed. p. 197.]

166. The particle स्म *sma*, mentioned in the preceding section, which introduces itself between the base and the termination, not only in the singular, but (and this, in fact, occurs in pronouns of the two first persons) in the plural also, if not separated from both—as I have first attempted to shew

---

* 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬆 *âfrîte* is undoubtedly incorrect: however, 𐬆 *e* is often found erroneously for 𐬉 *e* in other forms also.

in my Sanskrit Grammar—gives to the pronominal declension the appearance of greater peculiarity than it in fact possesses. As this particle recurs also in the cognate European languages, and there, as I have already elsewhere partly shewn, solves several enigmas of declension, we will therefore here, at its first appearance, pursue all its modifications and corruptions, as far as it is possible. In Zend, *sma*, according to §. 53., has been changed to *hma*; and also in Prâkṛit and Pâli, in the plural of the two first persons, the *s* has become *h*, and besides, by transposition of the two consonants, the syllable *hma* has been altered to *mha*; *e.g.* Prâkṛit अम्हे *amhê*, "we" (ἄμμες), Pâli अम्हाकम् *amhâkam*, Zend 𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬁𐬐𐬆𐬨 *ahmâkĕm*, ἡμῶν. From the Prâkṛit-Pâli *mha* we arrive at the Gothic *nsa* in *u-nsa-ra*, ἡμῶν, *u-nsi-s*,* "*nobis*," "*nos*." In that the Gothic has left the sibilant unaltered, it stands on an older footing than the Pâli and Prâkṛit; and on the other hand, by the change of *m* into *n*, for more facile combination with the following *s*, it rests on a more modern stage. We cannot, therefore, any longer assume the *ns* of *uns*, "*nos*," to be [G. Ed. p. 198.] the common accusative termination, as we have formerly done in unison with Grimm†—cf. *vulfa-ns*, *gasti-ns*, *sunu-ns*—and thence allow it, as though it had become a property of the base, to enter into some other cases, and connect it with new case-terminations. To this is opposed, also, the 2d person, where *izvis* (*i-zvi-s*) stands in the accusative, and yet in essentials the two persons are identical in their declension; *uns*, "*nobis*," "*nos*," stands, therefore, for *unsi-s* (from *unsa-s*), and this has *s* as the case-suffix, and *u-nsa* (weakened from *u-nsi*) as the compound base. And we cannot, also, any longer regard the *u* of *unsa-ra*, "*nostri*," &c. as the vocalized *v* of *veis*, "we," although the *i* of *izvara*, "*vestri*," &c. can be nothing else than the vocalized *y* of *yus*, "your"; for in Sanskṛit, also, the syllable यु *yu* of *yûyam*, "ye," (§. 43.) goes through all the oblique cases, while in the 1st person the व् *v* of वयम् *vayam*, "we," is limited to the nominative, but the oblique cases combine a base अ *a* with the particle स्म *sma*. This *a*, then, in Gothic, through the influence of the following liquid, has become *u*; hence, *unsa-ra*, &c. for *ans-ara* (§. 66.).

---

* The *a* being changed into *i*, according to r. 67.

† I. 813. "*unsara* appears to be derived from the accusative *uns*, as also the dative *unsis*, which, with *izwis*, preserves a parallel sound to the dative singular." Cf. I. 813. 34.

167. As in Zend, the Sanskṛit possessive स्व *swa* shews itself* in very different forms in juxta-position with different letters, so I believe I can point out the particle स्म *sma* in Gothic at least under four forms; namely, as *nsa*, *zva*, *gka*, and *mma*. The first has been already discussed; the second—*zva*, and in a weakened form *zvi*—occurs in the pronoun of the 2d person, in the place where the 1st has *nsa* (*nsi*); and while in the cognate Asiatic languages (Sanskṛit, Zend, Pâli, Prâkṛit), as also in Greek and Lithuanian, the two pronouns run quite [G. Ed. p. 199.] parallel in the plural, since they both exhibit the interposed particle under discussion, either in its original form, or similarly modified, in Gothic a discrepancy has arisen between the two persons, in that the syllable *sma* has in them been doubly transformed. The form *zva* from *sma* rests, first, on the not surprising change of the *s* into *z* (§. 86. 5.); secondly, on the very common change of *m* and *v* (§. 63.).

168. From the Gothic downwards, the particle *sma* has been still further corrupted in the German dialects, in the pronoun of the 2d person, by the expulsion of the sibilant. The Old High German *i-wa-r* has nearly the same relation to the Gothic *i-zva-ra* that the Homeric genitive τοῖο has

---

* See Ann. of Lit. Crit. March 1831, p. 376, &c.

to the Sanskṛit तस्य *tasya*, which is older than the Homeric form. Compare, without intervention of the Gothic, the Old High German *i-wa-r*, *i-u*, *i-wi-h*, with the Sanskṛit *yu-ṣhmâ-kam*, *yu-ṣhma-bhyam*, *yu-ṣhmâ-n*, and with the Lithuanian *ỵù-sû*, *ỵù-mus*, *ỵù-s*: thus it would be regarded as settled, that the *w* or *u* belongs to the base, but is not the corrupted remainder of a far-extended intermediate pronoun; and it would be incorrect to divide *iw-ar*, *iw-ih*, *iu*, for *i-wa-r*, &c. I, too, formerly entertained that erroneous opinion. A repeated examination, and the enlarged views since then obtained through the Zend, Prâkṛit, and Pâli, leave me thoroughly convinced, that the Gothic intermediate syllable *zva* has not been lost in High German, but that one portion of it has been preserved even to our time (*e-ue-r* from *i-zva-ra*, *e-u-ch* from *i-zvi-s*, Old High German *i-wi-h*): on the other hand, the *u* of the base *yu* (यु *yu*), as in Gothic so also in the oldest form of the High [G. Ed. p. 200.] German, is rejected in the oblique cases, both in the plural and in the dual*; and the Gothic *i-zva-ra*, Old High German *i-wa-r*, &c., stand for *yu-zva-ra*, *ỵu-wa-r*. The Old Saxon, however, and Anglo-Saxon, like the Lithuanian, shew themselves, in respect to the preservation of the base, more complete than the Gothic, and carry the *u*, which in Anglo-Saxon has become *o*, through all the oblique cases: *iu-we-r*, *ëo-ve-r*, "*vestri*," &c. If merely the two historical extremes of the forms here under discussion—the Sanskṛit and New German forms—be contrasted with one another, the assertion must appear very paradoxical, that *euer* and युष्माकम् *yuṣhmâkam* are connected, and, indeed, in such wise, that the *u* of *euer* has nothing in common with the *u* of यु *yu*, but finds its origin in the *m* of the syllable स्म *sma*.

---

* So much the more remarkable is the *u*, which is still retained in the North Friesian dialect (Grimm, p. 814), where, *e.g.* *ỵu-nke-r*, *ỵu-nk*, in regard to the base, distinguishes itself advantageously from the Gothic *i-gqva-ra*, *i-ṇqvi-s*.

169. The distinction of the dual and plural in the oblique cases of the two first persons is not organic in German; for the two plural numbers are distinguished originally only by the case-terminations. These, however, in our pronouns are, in Gothic, the same; and the difference between the two plural numbers appears to lie in the base—*ugka-ra*,* *νῶϊν*, *unsa-ra*, *ἡμῶν*, *igqva-ra*, *σφῶϊν*, *izva-ra*, *ὑμῶν*. But from a more close analysis of the forms in the two plural numbers, and from the light afforded us by the cognate Asiatic languages, it appears that the proper base is also identical in the two plural numbers; and it is only the particle *sma* combined with it which has become doubly corrupted, and then the one form has become fixed in the dual, the other in the plural. The former comes nearest to [G. Ed. p. 201.] the Prâkṛit-Pâli form म्ह *mha*, and between *u-nsa-ra* and *u-gka-ra* (=*u-nka-ra*) an intervening *u-nha-ra* or *u-mha-ra* must be assumed. At least I do not think that the old *s* became *k* at one spring, but that the latter is a hardened form of an earlier *h*, which has remained in the Prâkṛit and Pâli, as in the singular nominative the *k* of *ik* has been developed from the *h* of अहम् *aham*. The second person gives, in Gothic, *qv* (=*kv* §. 86. 1.) for *k*, while the other dialects leave the guttural the same form in both persons: Old High German, *u-ncha-r*, *i-ncha-r*; Old Slavonic, *u-nke-r*, *i-nke-r*; Anglo-Saxon, *u-nce-r*, *i-nce-r*. It would consequently appear proved that the dual and plural of the two first persons are not organically or originally different, but belong, as distortions and mutilations of different kinds, to one and the same original form; and that therefore these two pronouns have preserved the old dual just as little as

---

* It must not be overlooked, that here *g* before *k* only represents the nasal answering to *k* (86. 1.).

the other pronouns and all substantive and adjective declensions.

170. The fourth form in which स्म *sma* appears in Gothic is that which I first remarked, and which I have brought forward already in the "Annals of Oriental Literature" (p. 16). What I have there said, that the datives singular, like *thamma, imma,* have arisen, by assimilation, from *tha-sma, i-sma,* I have since found remarkably confirmed by the Grammar of the Old Prussian published by Vater, a language which is nearly connected with the Lithuanian and Gothic, since here all pronouns of the third person have *smu* in the dative. Compare, *e.g. antar-smu* with the Gothic *anthara-mma,* "to the other": *ka-smu* with the Gothic *hva-mma,* "to whom?" We have also shewn in Greek, since then, a remnant of the appended pronoun स्म *sma* similar to the Gothic, and which rests on assimilation, [G. Ed. p. 202.] since we deduced the Æolic forms *ἄ-μμ-ες, ὔ-μμ-ες,* &c., from *ἄ-σμε-ες, ὔ-σμε-ες,* to which the common forms *ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς,* have the same relation that the Old High German *de-mu* has to the Gothic *tha-mma,* only that *ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς,* in respect to the termination *εῖς,* are more perfect than the Æolic forms, since they have not lost the vowel of the particle *σμε,* but have contracted *με-ες* to *μεῖς.*

171. The Gothic datives in *mma* are, as follows from §. 160., by origin, instrumentals,* although the particle *sma* in Sanskṛit has not made its way into these cases, and *e.g.* तेन *têna,* "through him," not *tasmêna,* or, according to the Zend principle (§. 158.), *tasma* (for *tasmâ*), is used;—I say, according to the Zend principle; for though in this

---

* The difference between the forms *thê, hvê,* explained at §. 159., and the datives *tha-mma, hva-mma,* consists first in this, that the latter express the case relation by the affixed particle, the former in the main base; secondly, in this, that *thamma, hvamma,* for *thammê, hvammê,* on account of their being polysyllabic, have not preserved the original length of the termination (cf. §. 137.)

language *hma* has entered into the instrumental masculine and neuter, this case in the base *ta* could only be 𐬙𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬀 *tahma* or 𐬙𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬁 *tahmâ* (from *ta-hma-â*). In the feminine, as we can sufficiently prove, the appended pronoun really occurs in the instrumental; and while *e.g.* from the masculine and neuter base 𐬀𐬥𐬀 *ana*, "this" (m.), "this" (n.), we have found the instrumental of the same sound 𐬀𐬥𐬀 *ana* not *anahma*, from the demonstrative base 𐬀 *a* occurs rather often the feminine instrumental 𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬫𐬀 *ahmy-a*, from the fem. base 𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬍 *ahmî*, increased by the appended pronoun.

172. The Sanskrit appended pronoun [G. Ed. p. 203.] स्म *sma* should, in the feminine, form either स्मा *smâ* or स्मी *smî*: on the latter is based the Zend form 𐬵𐬨𐬍 *hmî*, mentioned at §. 171. But in Sanskrit the feminine form स्मी *smî* has been preserved only in such a mutilated condition,* that before my acquaintance with the Zend I could not recognise it. From *ta-smî* must come the dative *ta-smy-âi*, the gen. and ablative *ta-smy-âs*, and the locative *ta-smy-âm*. These forms, by rejecting the *m*, have become abbreviated to तस्यै *ta-sy-âi*, तस्यास् *ta-sy-âs*, तस्याम् *ta-sy-âm*; and the same is the case with the feminine pronoun *smî* in all similar compounds; so that the forms mentioned appear to have proceeded from the masculine and neuter genitive *tasya*, by the annexation of new case-terminations. This opinion was the more to be relied on, that in Gothic, also, the feminine forms *thi-zôs*, "*hujus*,"

---

* The Zend, too, has not everywhere so fully preserved the feminine *hmî*, as in the instr. *a-hmy-a;* but in the genitive, dative, and ablative has gone even farther than the Sanskrit in the demolition of this word, and has therein rejected not only the *m* but also the *î*. The feminine 𐬀𐬧𐬵𐬃 *a-ṇh-âo* (§. 56ª.), "*hujus*," for *a-hmy-âo*, often occurs; and for it also 𐬀𐬌𐬧𐬵𐬃 *ainh-âo*, in which the *i* is, to use the expression, a reflection of the lost 𐬫 *y* (§. 41.). From another demonstrative base we find the dative 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬧𐬵𐬁𐬌 *ava-ṇh-âi*, and more than once the ablative 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬧𐬵𐬁𐬝 *ava-ṇh-ât* for *ava-hmy-âi*, *ava-hmy-ât*.

thi-zai, "*huic*," might be deduced from the masculine geniti *this*, by the addition of the terminations *ôs* and *ai*; and as, t in Lithuanian, the whole of the oblique cases singular of t 1st and 2d person stand in close connection with the Sanskri Zend genitives मम *mama*, 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀 *mana*, तव *tava*, 𐬙𐬀𐬬𐬀 *tav* and have the same as base. After discovering the Zend fe [G. Ed. p. 204.] minine pronominal forms in *hmy-a* in th instrumental and locative—in the latter for *hmy-aṅm*—th above-mentioned forms in Sanskṛit cannot be regarded otherwise than as abbreviations of *ta-smy-âi*, &c., as this is far more suited to the nature of the thing. The Gothic forms then, *thizôs*, *thizai*, will be regarded as abbreviated, and must be divided into *thi-zô-s*, *thi-zai*. The masculine and neuter appended pronoun *sma* must, for instance, in Gothic give the feminine base *SMŌ* = स्मा *smâ*, as *BLINDŌ*, nom. *blinda*, "*cœca*," from *BLINDA*, m. n. (nom. *blind'-s*, *blinda-ta*). *SMŌ*, however, by the loss of the *m*, as experienced by the Sanskṛit in the feminine, has become *SŌ*; but the *s*, on account of its position between two vowels (according to §. 86. 5.), has become *z*. Therefore, *thi-zô-s** has only *s* as case-sign, and the dative *thi-zai*, like *gibai* in §. 161., is without case character. With the masculine and neuter genitive *thi-s*, therefore, *thi-zô-s*, *thi-zai*, have nothing in common but the demonstrative theme *THA*, and the weakening of its *a* to *i* (§. 66.).

173. Gothic adjective bases in *a* (Grimm's strong adjectives) which follow the pronominal declension, differ from it, however, in this point, that they do not weaken the final *a* of the base before the appended pronoun to *i*, but extend it to *ai*, and form the feminine dative from the simple theme, according to the analogy of the substantives:† hence *blindai-zô-s*, *blindai*, not *blindi-zô-s*, *blindi-zai*.

---

* Cf. §. 356. Rem. 3. p. 501. last line but seven.

† With respect to the extension of the *a* to *ai*, compare the gen. pl. and Sanskṛit forms, as *tê-bhyas*, "*iis*," *têshâm*, "*eorum*," for *ta-bhyas*, *ta-sâm*.

174. The Zend introduces our pronominal syllable *sma* in the form of *hma* also into the second, and probably into the first person too: we find repeatedly, in the locative, 𐬚𐬬𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬍 *thwa-hm'-î*, instead of the Sanskṛit [G. Ed. p. 205.] त्वयि *tway-i*, and hence deduce, in the 1st person, *ma-him'-î*, which we cannot quote as occurring. The Prâkṛit, in this respect, follows the analogy of the Zend; and in the 2d person gives the form तुमस्मि *tuma-sm'-i*, "in thee," or, with assimilation, तुमम्मि *tumammi*, with तुमे *tumê* (from *tuma-ï*) and तइ *taï*; and mamasmi *mama-sm'-i* or ममम्मि *mama-mmi*, "in me," together with the simple मए *maê* and मइ *maï*.* Ought not, therefore, in German also, in the singular of the two first persons, a remnant of the pronominal syllable *sma* to be looked for? The *s* in the Gothic *mi-s*, "to me," *thu-s*, "to thee," and *si-s*, "to himself," appears to me in no other way intelligible; for in our Indo-European family of languages there exists no *s* as the suffix of the instrumental or dative. Of similar origin is the *s* in the plural *u-nsi-s*, "*nobis*," "*nos*," *i-zvi-s*, "*vobis*," "*vos*"; and its appearance in two otherwise differently denoted cases cannot therefore be surprising, because this *s* is neither the dative nor accusative character, but belongs to a syllable, which could be declined through all cases, but is here deprived of all case-sign. In *u-nsi-s*, *i-zvi-s*, therefore, the Sanskṛit स्म *sma* is doubly contained, once as the base, and next as the apparent case-suffix. I am inclined, also, to affirm of the above-mentioned Prâkṛit forms, *tu-ma-sm'i*, "in thee," and *ma-ma-sm'i*, "in me," that they doubly contain the pronominal syllable *sma*, and that the middle syllable has dropped a preceding *s*. For there is no more favourite and facile combination in our class of languages than of a pronoun with a pronoun; and what is omitted by one dialect in this respect is often afterwards supplied by another more modern dialect.

---

* See *Essai sur le Pali*, by E. Burnouf and Lassen, pp. 173. 175.

[G. Ed. p. 206.] 175. The *k* in the Gothic accusatives *mi-k*, *thu-k*, *si-k* (*me*, *te*, *se*), may be deduced, as above, in *u-gka-ra*, *νῶϊν*, &c., from *s*, by the hardening of an intervening *h*; so that *mi-s* is altered to *mi-h*, and thence to *mi-k*; and therefore, in the singular, as also in the plural, the dative and accusative of the two first persons are, in their origin, identical. In Old High German and Anglo-Saxon our particle appears in the accusative singular and plural in the same form: Old High German *mi-h* "me," *di-h*, "thee," *u-nsi-h*, "us," *i-ui-h*, "you"; Anglo-Saxon *me-c*, "me," *u-si-c*, "us," *the-c*, "thee," *eo-vi-c*, "you": on the other hand, in the dative singular the old *s* of the syllable *sma* has become *r* in the High German, but has disappeared in the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon: Old High German *mi-r*, *di-r*; Old Saxon *mi*, *thi*; Anglo-Saxon *me*, *the*.

176. In Lithuanian स्म *sma* appears in the same form as in the middle of the above-mentioned (§. 174.) Prâkṛit forms; namely, with *s* dropped, as *ma*; and indeed, first, in the dative and locative sing. of the pronouns of the 3d person and adjectives; and, secondly, in the genitive dual of the two first persons: we cannot, however, refer to this the *m*, which the latter in some cases have in common with the substantive declension. The pronominal base *TA*, and the adjective base *GERA*, form, in the dative, *tá-mui*, "to thee," *gerá-mui*, "to the good" (shortened *tám*, *gerám*), and in the locative *ta-mè*, *gera-mè*; and if *-mui* and *-mè* are compared with the corresponding cases of the substantive *a* bases, it is easily seen that *mui* and *mè* have sprung from *ma*. The pronouns of the two first persons form, in the genitive dual, *mu-mû*, *yu-mû*, according to the analogy of *ponû*, "of the two lords."

---

* We have a remnant of a more perfect form of the particle स्म *sma* in the locative interrogative form *ka-mmè*, "where"? Sansk. कस्मिन् *ka-sm̀in*, "in

177. Lithuanian substantives have *i* for [G. Ed. p. 207.] the dative character, but *i* bases have *ei**; a final *a* before this *i* passes into *u*; hence *wilku-i*. Although we must refuse a place in the locative to the dative *i* of the Greek and Latin, still this Lithuanian dative character appears connected with the Indo-Zend *ê*, so that only the last element of this diphthong, which has grown out of *a*+*i*, has been left. For the Lithuanian has, besides the dative, also a real locative, which, indeed, in the *a* bases corresponds exactly with the Sanskrit and Zend.

178. The nominal bases, Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian, explained at §. 148., excepting the neuters ending with a vowel and pronouns, to the full declension of which we shall return hereafter, form in the dative:

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	LITHUANIAN.
m.	*vṛikâya*,	*vĕhrkâi*,	*wilku-i*.
f.	*jihwây-âi*,	*hizvay-âi*,	*ranka-i*.
m.	*paty-ê*,†	*paite-ê*? ‡	*pách-ei*.
f.	*prîtay-ê*,	*âfrîte-ê*,	*áwi-ei*.
f.	*bhavishyanty-âi*,	*bûshyainty-âi*,	. . . .
m.	*sûnav-ê*,	*pas̊v-ê*,	*sunu-i*.

"in whom," which, according to the common declension, would be कस्मे *kasmê* (from *kasma-i*). Compare the Gothic *hvamma*, "to whom?" for *hvasma*.

* The form *áwiui*, with *áwiei* appears to admit of being explained as arising from the commixture of the final vowel of the *a* bases.

† The form पत्ये *patyê* is, with respect to its want of Guna, irregular, and should be पतये *patayê*.

‡ In combination with 𐬗𐬀 *cha* we find in V. S., p. 473. 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬚𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬗𐬀 *paithyê-cha*, and hence deduce for the instrumental (p. 193 G. Ed.) the form *paithya*, while, according to §. 47., also *paitya* might be expected. From 𐬵𐬀𐬗𐬌 *haci*, "friend," I find in V. S., p. 162, the instrumental 𐬵𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀 *hacaya* with Guna, after the analogy of the 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬀𐬬𐬀 *bâzava*, mentioned at §. 160.

[G. Ed. p. 208.]

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	LITHUANIAN.
f.	*tanav-ê,*	*tanu-y-ê,**	....
f.	*vadhv-âi,*	....	....
m. f.	*gav-ê,*	*gav-ê,*	....
f.	*nâv-ê,*	....	....
f.	*vâch-ê,*	*vâch-ê,*	....
m.	*bharat-ê,*	*barĕnt-ê,*	....
m.	*âtman-ê,*	*aśmain-ê,*	....
n.	*nâmn-ê,*‡	*nâmain-ê,*	....
m.	*bhrâtr-ê,*	*brâthr-ê,*	....
f.	*duhitr-ê,*	*dughdhĕr-ê,*†	....
m.	*dâtr-e,*	*dâthr-ê,*	....
n.	*vachas-ê,*‡	*vachanh-ê,*	....

---

* I give 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎𐬫𐬉 *tanuyê* with euphonic *y*, because I have found this form frequently, which, however, cannot, for this reason, be considered as peculiar to the feminine; and, instead of it, also *tanvê* and *tanavê* may be regarded as equally correct. Cf. §. 43., where, however, it is necessary to observe, that the insertion of a euphonic 𐬫 *y* between *u* and *ê* is not everywhere necessary; and, for instance, in the dative is the more rare form.

† The 𐬆 *ĕ* in 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬆𐬭𐬉 *dughdhĕrê*, and in the instr. 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬆𐬭𐬀 *dughdhĕra*, is placed there merely to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants. I deduce these forms from the plural genitive 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬆𐬭𐬄𐬨 *dughdhĕr-aṅm*, for 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬭𐬄𐬨 *dughdhr-aṅm*.

‡ Respecting नाम्ने *nâmnê*, for नामने *nâmanê*, and so in the instrumental नाम्ना *nâmnâ*, for नामना *nâmanâ*, see §. 140. In Zend, in this and similar words, I have not met with the rejection of the *a* in the weakest cases (§. 130.), but examples of its retention, *e.g.* in the compound *aoctô-nâman*, whence the genitive *aoctô-nâmanô* (Vend. S. p. 4, and frequently). I consider the initial *a* in this compound as the negation, without euphonic *n*; for in all probability it means "having untold (countless) names." Similar compounds precede, viz. 𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬭𐬋 𐬔𐬀𐬋𐬱𐬀𐬵𐬉 𐬠𐬀𐬉𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬆 𐬗𐬀𐬱𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬋 *hazanrô-ghaôshahê baêvarĕ-chashmanô*, "of the thousand eared, ten thousand eyed." Cf. Anquetil II. 82. In words in *van*, on the other hand, 𐬀 *a* is rejected in the weakest cases, and then the 𐬬 *v* becomes 𐬎 *u* or 𐬋 *o*. Regarding the addition of the 𐬌 *i* in 𐬥𐬁𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬉 *nâmainê*, see §. 41.

ABLATIVE.

179. The Ablative in Sanskṛit has त् *t* [G. Ed. p. 209.] for its character, regarding the origin of which there can no longer be any uncertainty, as soon as the influence of pronouns on the formation of cases has been recognised, as we are conducted at once to the demonstrative base *ta*, which already, in the neuter nominative, and accusative, has assumed the nature of a case-sign, and which we shall subsequently, under the verb, see receiving the function of a personal termination. This ablative character, however, has remained only in bases in अ *a*, which is lengthened before it; a circumstance that induced the Indian Grammarians, who have been followed by the English, to represent आत् *ât* as the ablative termination. It would therefore be to be assumed, that in वृकात् *vṛikât* the *a* of the base has been melted down with the *â* of the termination.*

180. M. E. Burnouf† has been the first [G. Ed. p. 210.] to bring home the ablative character to a class of words in Zend which had lost it in Sanskṛit, and whence it can be satisfactorily inferred that a simple *t*, and not *ât*, is the true ablative character. We mean the declension in *u*, of which hereafter. As regards bases in *a*, which in Sanskṛit alone have preserved the ablative, we have to observe, that in

---

* I have drawn attention already, in the first (German) edition of my Sanskṛit Grammar, to the arbitrary and unfounded nature of this assumption (§§. 156. and 264.); and I have deduced from the ablatives of the pronouns of the two first persons (*mat*, *twat*) that either *at* with short *a*, or, more correctly, a simple *t*, must be regarded as the ablative termination. This view I supported in the Latin edition of my Grammar, on the ground that in old Latin also a simple *d* appears as the suffix of the ablative. But since then the justness of my opinion regarding the Sanskṛit ablative has been still more emphatically confirmed by the Zend language, because the Zend stands in a closer and more evident connection with the Sanskṛit than does the Latin.

† Nouveau Journal Asiatique 1829, tom. III. 311.

Zend also the short vowel is lengthened, and thus 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬁𐬝 *vĕhrkâ-ṭ* answers to वृकात् *vrikâ-t*. Bases in 𐬌 *i* have *ôi-t* in the ablative; whence may be inferred in Sanskrit ablatives like पतेत् *patê-t*, प्रीतेत् *prîtê-t* (§. 33.), which, by adding Guna to the final vowel, would agree with genitives in *ê-s*. The Zend-Avesta, as far as it is hitherto edited, nevertheless offers but few examples of such ablative forms in 𐬋𐬌𐬝 *ôi-ṭ*: I owe the first perception of them to the word 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬋𐬌𐬝 *âfrîtôiṭ*, "*benedictione*," in a passage of the Vendidâd,* explained elsewhere, which recurs frequently. Examples of masculine bases are perhaps 𐬭𐬀𐬘𐬊𐬌𐬝 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬚𐬎𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬝 *rajoiṭ zaratustrôiṭ*, "*institutione zaratustrica*" (V. S. p. 86), although otherwise 𐬭𐬀𐬘𐬌 *raji*, which I have not elsewhere met with, is a masculine: the adjective base *zaratustri*, however, belongs to the three genders. From 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌 *gairi*, "mountain," [G. Ed. p. 211.] occurs the ablative 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬝 *garôiṭ* in the Yescht-Sâde.† Bases in *u* have 𐬀𐬊𐬝 *ao-ṭ*‡ in the ablative‖; and in no class of words, with the exception of that in *a*, does the ablative more frequently occur, although these words are in number but five or six, the ablative use of which is very frequent; *e.g.* 𐬛𐬁𐬊𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬋𐬝 *dâoṇhaôt*, "*creatione*," from *dâoṇhu*, in a passage explained elsewhere* 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬋𐬝 *aṇhaô-ṭ*, "*mundo*," from 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬎 *aṇhu*; 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬋𐬝 *tanaôṭ* "*corpore*," from 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎 *tanu*. Bases ending with consonants are just as little able to annex the [G. Ed. p. 212.] ablative 𐬝 *ṭ* without the intervention of another letter, as the accusative is to annex *m* without an intermediate letter; and they have *at* as their termination, numerous examples of which occur; *e.g.* 𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬝 *ap-aṭ*, "*aquâ*"; 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬝 *âthr-aṭ*, "*igne*"; 𐬗𐬀𐬱𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬝 *chashman-aṭ*, "*oculo*"; 𐬥𐬁𐬊𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬝 *nâoṇhan-aṭ* "*naso*"; 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘𐬀𐬝 *druj-aṭ*, "*dæmone*"; 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬀𐬝 *vîś-aṭ*, "*loco*" (cf. *vicus*, according to §. 21.). Owing to the facile interchange of the 𐬀 *a* with 𐬁 *â*, 𐬁𐬝 *âṭ* is sometimes erroneously written for 𐬀𐬝 *aṭ*; thus, Vendidâd S. p. 338, 𐬯𐬀𐬋𐬗𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬁𐬝 *śaôchant-âṭ* for 𐬯𐬀𐬋𐬗𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬀𐬝 *śaôchant-aṭ* "*lucente*." Bases in *u* sometimes follow the

---

* See Gramm. Crit. add. ad r. 156.

† What Anquetil III. 170. Rem. 4, writes *gueröed* can be nothing else than the ablative 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬝 *garôiṭ*, for Anquetil generally expresses 𐬔 by *gu*, 𐬀 by *e*, 𐬋𐬌 by *ôe*, and 𐬝 by *d*. The nominal base 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌 *gairi*, however, is treated in Zend as if *gari* was the original form, and the *i* which precedes the *r* was produced by the final *i*, as remarked by M. Burnouf in the article quoted at p. 173, and confirmed by the genitive 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬱 *garôis*. That, however, which is remarked by M. Burnouf, l. c. with respect to the genitive, and of which the Vend. S. p. 64. affords frequent proof in the genitive 𐬞𐬀𐬙𐬋𐬌𐬱 *patôis*, must also be extended to the ablative in *ôit*; and the *i*, which, according to §. 41., is adduced through the final 𐬌 *i* of the base, is dropped again before this termination.

‡ For this we also find 𐬈𐬎𐬝 *euṭ*; *e.g.* 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬈𐬎𐬝 *mainyeuṭ* from *mainyu*.

‖ Interchanges of 𐬊 *o* and 𐬋 *ô* are particularly common, owing to the slight difference of these letters. Thus, *e.g.* for 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬋𐬝 *mraôṭ*, "he spoke," occurs very frequently 𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬝 *mraoṭ*; the former, however, is, as we can satisfactorily prove, the right reading; for, first, it is supported by

---

by the Sanskrit form अब्रोत् *abrôt*, for which the irregular form अब्रवीत् *abrav-ît* is used; and secondly, it answers to the 1st pers. *mraôm* (V. S. p. 123); thirdly, the Sanskrit ओ *ô* is, in Zend, never represented by 𐬀𐬊 *ao*, but by 𐬋 *ô*, before which, according to §. 28., another 𐬀 *a* is placed, hence 𐬀𐬋 *aô*: on the other hand, 𐬀𐬊 *ao* represents *u*, in accordance with §. 32 and §. 28. If, then, 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎 *paśu* formed in the ablative 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬊𐬝 *paśaoṭ*, this would conduct us to a Sanskrit पशुत् *paśu t*; while from the ablatives 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬋𐬌𐬝 *âfrîtôi-ṭ*, 𐬰𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬙𐬎𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬝 *zaratustrôi-t*, 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬝 *garôi-ṭ*, and from the analogy, in other respects, with the genitive, the Guna form, पशोत् *paśô-t* must be deduced. Moreover, in the Vend. S. the ablative form 𐬀𐬋𐬝 *aô-ṭ* actually occurs; for at p. 102. (𐬵𐬀𐬗𐬀 𐬬𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬈𐬀𐬋𐬝 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬝 *hacha vaṇheaô-t manaṇh-aṭ*, "from pure spirit") occurs *vaṇheaôṭ*, the ablative of *vaṇhu*; and the 𐬈 *e* preceding the *a* is an error in orthography, and *vaṇhaôṭ* is the form intended: p. 245 occurs 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬋𐬝 *aṇhaôṭ*, "*mundo*," from *aṇhu*.

* Gramm. Crit. §. 640. ann. 2.

consonantal declension in having 𐬀𐬝 *aṭ* as the ablative termination instead of a mere *ṭ*; just as in the genitive, besides a simple *s*, they exhibit also an *ô* (from *as*, §. 56^{b}.), although more rarely. Thus, for the above-mentioned 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬊𐬝 *tanaoṭ*, "*corpore*," occurs also *tanv-aṭ* (Vend. S. p. 482).* Feminine bases in 𐬁 *â* and 𐬍 *î* have 𐬁𐬝 *âṭ* in the ablative, as an analogous form to the feminine genitive termination आस् *âs*, whence, in the Zend 𐬃𐬊 *âo*; *e.g.* 𐬛𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬀𐬫𐬁𐬝 *dahmay-âṭ*, "*præclara*," from 𐬛𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬁 *dahmâ*; 𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬫𐬁𐬝 *urvaray-âṭ*) "*arbore*," from 𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬁 *urvarâ*; 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬫𐬁𐬝 [G. Ed. p. 213.] *barĕthry-âṭ*, "*genitrice*," from 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬍 *barĕthrî*.† The feminine bases also in *u*, and perhaps also those in *i*, may share this feminine termination 𐬁𐬝 *âṭ*; thus, from *zantu*, "begetting," comes the ablative *zanthw-âṭ* (cf. Gramm. Crit. §. 640. Rem. 2.). Although, then, the ablative has been sufficiently shewn to belong to all declensions in Zend, and the ablative relation is also, for the most part, denoted by the actual ablative, still the genitive not unfrequently occurs in the place of the ablative, and even adjectives in the genitive in construction with substantives in the ablative. Thus we read, Vend S. p. 479, 𐬵𐬀𐬗𐬀 𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬁𐬝 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬀𐬝 𐬫𐬀𐬝 𐬨𐬁𐬰𐬛𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬯𐬥𐬋𐬌𐬱 *hacha avaṇhâṭ*‡ *visaṭ yaṭ mâzdayasnôis*, "*ex hac terrâ quidem mazdayasnicâ.*"

---

* Burnouf writes *tanavat*, probably according to another Codex. I hold both forms to be correct, the rather as in the genitive, also, both *tanv-ô* and *tanav-ô* occur; and in general, before all terminations beginning with a vowel, both the simple form and that with Guna are possible.

† Vendidâd Sâde, p. 436: 𐬫𐬀𐬚𐬀 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬋 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬡𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬘𐬀𐬢𐬔𐬭𐬋 𐬥𐬌𐬱𐬛𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬛𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬫𐬁𐬝 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬫𐬀𐬝 𐬵𐬀𐬗𐬀 𐬞𐬎𐬚𐬭𐬆𐬨 *Yatha vehrkô chathwarĕ-jangrô nishdarĕdairyâṭ barĕthryaṭ hacha puthrĕm*, "As a wolf, a four-footed animal, tears a child from its mother." This sentence is also important as an example of the intensive form (cf. Gramm. Crit. §. 363.). The Codex, however, divides incorrectly *nishdarĕ dairyâṭ*.

‡ Regarding this form, see p. 172. Rem.

181. The Old Roman corresponds with the Zend in regard to the designation of the ablative; and in those two memorials of the language, that on the *Columna rostrata*, and the *S. C. de Bacchanalibus*, which are the most important inscriptions that remain, all ablatives end with *d*; so that it is surprising that the ablative force of this letter could be overlooked, and that the empty name of a paragogic *d* could be held satisfactory. Bases ending with a consonant use *ed* as ablative suffix, as in the accusative they have *em* instead of a simple *m*: hence, forms like *præsent-ed dictator-ed*, answer to the Zend *ṡaôchant-at âthr-at* (*lucente igne*); while *navale-d** *præda-d*, *inalto-d mari-d*, *senatu-d*, like the above-mentioned Zend forms 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬌𐬝 *garôi-ṭ*, "*monte*," 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬋𐬝 *tanaô-ṭ*, "*corpore*," &c.; and in Sanskrit वृकात् *vṛikâ-t*, "*lupo*," have a simple *T* sound to denote the ablative. The Oscan also takes the ablative sign *d* through all declensions, as appears from the remarkable inscription of Bantia, *e.g.* *dolu-d* [G. Ed p. 214.] *mallu-d*, *cum preivatu-d*, *touta-d præsenti-d*.† It may be preliminarily observed, that, in the 3d person of the imperative, old Latin and Oscan forms like *es-tod*, *es-tud*—for *es-to*, and therefore with a double designation of person—correspond remarkably to similar Vêda forms with which we are hitherto acquainted only from Pânini; *e.g.* जीवतात् *jîva-tât*, which signifies both "*vivat*" and "*vive*," but in the latter sense is probably only an error in the use of the language (cf. *vivito* as 3d and 2d person).

182. In classical Latinity a kind of petrified ablative form appears to be contained in the appended pronoun *met*, which may be transferred from the 1st person to the others also, and answers to the Sanskṛit ablative *mat*, "from me." But it is possible, also, that *met* may have

---

* The *e* here belongs to the base, which alternates between *e* and *i*.

† See O. Müller's Etruscans, p. 36.

dropped an initial *s*, and may stand for *smet*, and so belong to the appended pronoun स्म *sma*, explained in §. 165. &c., corresponding with its ablative *smât*, to which it stands in the same relation that *memor* (for *mesmor*) does to स्मृ *smṛi*—from *smar*, §. 1.—"to remember." The combination of this syllable, then, with pronouns of the three persons, would require no excuse, for स्म *sma*, as has been shewn, unites itself to all persons, though it must itself be regarded as a pronoun of the 3d person.* The conjunction *sed*, too, is certainly nothing but the ablative of the reflexive; and *sed* occurs twice in the *S. C. de Bacch.* as an evident pronoun, and, in fact, governed by *inter;* [G. Ed. p. 215.] whence it may be assumed that *inter* can be used in construction with the ablative, or also that, in the old languages, the accusative is the same with the ablative: the latter view is confirmed by the accusative use of *ted* and *med* in Plautus.

† 183. In Sanskṛit the ablative expresses distance from a place, the relation "whence;" and this is the true, original destination of this case, to which the Latin remained constant in the names of towns. From the relation "whence," however, the ablative is, in Sanskṛit, transferred to the causal relation also; since that on account of which any thing is done is regarded as the place whence an action proceeds. In this manner the confines of the ablative and instrumental touch one another, and तेन *têna* (§. 158.) and तस्मात् *tasmât*, may both express "on account of which." In adverbial use the ablative spreads still further, and in some words denotes relations, which are otherwise foreign to the ablative. In Greek, adverbs in ως may be looked upon as sister forms of the Sanskṛit ablative; so that ω-ς, from bases in *o*, would have the same relation to the Sanskṛit

---

* The reduplication in *me-mor*, from *me-smor*, would be of the kind used in Sanskṛit, *e.g. pasparśa*, "he touched," of which hereafter.

† Cf. the Gothic ablatives in *ô*, adduced in §. 294. Rem. 1. p. 384.

आत् *â-t*, from bases in *a*, that, *e.g.* *δίδωσι* has to ददाति *dadâ-ti*. Thus, *ὁμῶ-ς* may be akin to the Sanskṛit समात् *samâ-t*, "from the similar," both in termination and in base. In Greek, the transition of the *T* sounds into *ς* was requisite, if indeed they were not to be entirely suppressed*; and in §. 152. we have seen neuter bases in *τ*, in the uninflected cases, preserve their final letter from being entirely lost by changing it into *ς*. We deduce, therefore, [G. Ed. p. 216.] adverbs like *ὁμῶ-ς*, *οὕτω-ς*, *ὡ-ς*, from *ὁμῷ-τ*, *οὕτω-τ*, *ὡ-τ* or *ὁμῶ-δ*, &c., and this is the only way of bringing these formations into comparison with the cognate languages; and it is not to be believed that the Greek has created for this adverbial relation an entirely peculiar form, any more than other case-terminations can be shewn to be peculiar to the Greek alone. The relation in adverbs in *ω-ς* is the same as that of Latin ablative forms like *hoc modo*, *quo modo*, *raro*, *perpetuo*. In bases ending with a consonant, *ος* for *οτ* might be expected as the termination, in accordance with Zend ablatives like 𐬗𐬀𐬱𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬝 *chashman-aṭ*, "*oculo*"; but then the ablative adverbial termination would be identical with that of the genitive: this, and the preponderating analogy of adverbs from *o* bases, may have introduced forms like *σωφρόν-ως*, which, with respect to their termination, may be compared with Zend feminine ablatives like 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬈𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬁𐬝 *barĕthry-âṭ*. We must also, with reference to the irregular length of this adverbial termination, advert to the Attic genitives in *ως* for *ος*.†

---

* As, in *οὕτω*, together with *οὕτω-s*, *ὧδε*, *ἄφνω*, and adverbs from prepositions—*ἔξω*, *ἄνω*, *κάτω*, &c. It is here desirable to remark, that in Sanskṛit, also, the ablative termination occurs in adverbs from prepositions, as अधस्तात् *adhastât*, "(from) beneath," पुरस्तात् *purastât*, "(from) before," &c. (Gram. Crit. §. 652. p. 279.).

† In compounds, remains of ablative forms may exist with the original *T* sound retained. We will therefore observe, that in *Ἀφροδίτη* the first member

THE GENITIVE.

[G. Ed. p. 217.] 184. In no case do the different members of the Sanskṛit family of languages agree so fully as in the genitive singular; only that in Latin the two first declensions, together with the fifth, as well as the two first persons of the pronouns, have lost their old termination, and have replaced it by that of the old locative. The Sanskṛit terminations of the genitive are स् *s*, स्य *sya*, अस् *as*, and आस् *âs*: the three first are common to the three genders: *as* is

---

member has a genuine ablative meaning; and as the division *ἀφρο-δίτη* admits of no satisfactory explanation, one may rest satisfied with *ἀφροδ-ίτη*. In Sanscrit, अभ्रादिता *abhrâditâ* would mean "the female who proceeded from a cloud," for *abhrâ-t* must become *abhrâd* before *itâ* (§. 93^{a}.); and in neuter verbs the otherwise passive participial suffix *ta* has usually a past active meaning. Of this usage *ιτη*, in *ἀφροδ-ίτη*, might be a remnant, and this compound might mean, therefore, "She who arose, who sprang, from foam." The only difficulty here is the short vowel of *οδ* for *ωδ*. As regards the Sanskṛit, here also the *s* of the ablative may in most declensions rest on an exchange with an older *t* (cf. p. 184 G. ed. Note); and, as the Zend gives us every reason to expect Sanskṛit ablatives like *jihwây-ât*, *prîtê-t*, *sûnô-t*, *bhavishyanty-ât*, *âtman-at*; so it will be most natural to refer the existing forms *jihwây-âs*, *prîtê-s*, &c., where they have an ablative meaning, to the exchange of *t* with *s*, which is more or less in vogue according to the variety of dialects; particularly as it is known, also, that, *vice versâ*, according to certain laws, स् *s* passes into त् *t* (Gramm. Crit. §. 100.). Consequently the identity between the genitive and ablative, in most declensions, would be only external, and the two cases would vary in their history; so that, *e.g.* *jihwây-âs* would be, in one sense, viz. in that of *linguæ*, independent and original; and in another, that of *linguâ*, a corruption of *jihwây-ât*. At the time when Sanskṛit and Zend were separated from one another, the retention of the original *t* must have been the prevailing inclination, and, together with it, may also its change into *s* have arisen, as the Zend also uses, at times, the genitive form with an ablative meaning (*e.g.* Vend. S. p. 177.).

principally confined to the consonantal bases,* and hence has the same relation to *s* that, in the accusative, *am* has to *m*, and, in the Zend ablative, *at* has to *t*.

185. Before the genitive sign स् *s* the [G. Ed. p. 218.] vowels इ *i* and उ *u* take Guna; and the Zend, and in a more limited degree, also the Lithuanian and Gothic, share this augment. All *u* bases, for example, in Lithuanian and Gothic, prefix an *a* to their final vowel: hence the Lithuanian *sunaù-s* and Gothic *sunau-s* correspond to the Sanskrit सूनोस् *sûnôs* (*filii*) from *sunaus* (§. 2.). In the *i* bases in Gothic, Guna is restricted to the feminines; thus *anstai-s*, "*gratiæ*," answers to प्रीतेस् *prîtê-s*. Respecting Lithuanian genitives of *i* bases see §. 193. The High German has, from the earliest period, dropped the genitive sign in all feminines: in consonantal bases (§§. 125. 127.) the sign of the genitive is wanting in the other genders also.

186. The form which the Sanskrit genitive termination after consonants assumes, as it were of necessity (§. 94.), viz. *as* for *s*, has in Greek, in the form *ος*, passed over also to the vowels *ι* and *υ* and diphthongs terminating in *υ*; and genitives like *πορτει-ς*, *ἰχθευ-ς*, which would be in accordance with §. 185. are unheard of; but *πόρτι-ος*, *ἰχθύ-ος* answer, like *ποδ-ός*, to Sanskrit genitives of consonantal bases, as पदस् *pad-as*, "*pedis*," वाचस् *vâch-as*, "*vocis*." The Latin, on the other hand, answers more to the other sister languages, but is without Guna: so *hosti-s* is like the Gothic genitive *gasti-s*. In the *u* bases (fourth declension) the lengthening of the *u* may replace the Guna, or, more correctly, this class of words followed the Greek or consonantal principle, and the vowel dropped before *s* was compensated for by

---

* Besides this, it occurs only in monosyllabic bases in ई *î*, ऊ *û*, ऐ *âi*, and औ *âu*; *e.g. rây-as*, "*rei*," *nâv-as*, "*navis*:" and in neuters in इ *i* and उ *u*, which, by the assumption of an euphonic न् *n*, assimilate to the consonantal declension in most cases.

190. In Lithuanian the genitives of the *a* bases differ remarkably from those of the other declensions, and denote the case by *o*, in which vowel, at the same time, the final vowel of the base is contained; thus, *wilko*, "*lupi*," for *wilka-s*. It is probable that this *o* ($\bar{o}$) has arisen from *a-s*, according to a contraction similar to that in the Zend (§. 56^{b}.). In old Sclavonic, also, *o* occurs, answering to the Sanskṛit *as*; and *nebo*, gen. *nebese*, corresponds to the Sanskṛit नभस् *nabhas*. That, however, the Lithuanian has left the syllable *as* in the nominative unaltered, but in the genitive has contracted it to *o*, may induce the remark, that like corruptions do not always find entrance in like places, if they have not raised themselves to a pervading law. In this manner, in Gothic, the old *a* has remained in the interrogative base *HVA* in the nominative (*hvas*), but in the genitive *hvi-s* the weakening to *i* has taken place; so that here, as in Lithuanian, only the more worthy powerful nominative has preserved the older more powerful form, and an unorganic difference has found its way into the two cases, which ought to be similar.

191. The Gothic has no more than the Lithuanian preserved a remnant of the more full genitive termination *sya*, and the Gothic *a* bases, in this case, resemble the *i* bases, because *a* before final *s* has, according to §. 67., become weakened to *i*; thus *vulfi-s* for *vulfa-s*; as also in Old Saxon the corresponding declension exhibits *a-s* together with *e-s*, although more rarely; thus, *daga-s*, "of the day," [G. Ed. p. 222.] answering to the Gothic *dagi-s*. The consonantal bases have, in Gothic, likewise a simple *s* for case-sign; hence, *ahmin-s*, *fiyand-s*, *brôthr-s* (§. 132.). The older sister dialects lead us to conjecture that originally an *a*, more lately an *i*, preceded this *s*—*ahmin-as*, *fiyand-as*, *brôthr-as*,—which, as in the nominative of the *a* bases (*vulf'-s* for *vulfa-s*), has been suppressed. The Zend exhibits in the *r* roots an agreement with the Gothic, and forms, *e.g.* 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬯 *nar-s*, "of

the man," not *nar-ô*, probably on account of the nature of the *r* bordering on that of a vowel, and of its facile combination with *s*.*

192. Feminines in Sanskṛit have a fuller genitive termination in bases ending with a vowel, viz. *âs* for simple *s* (see §. 113.); and, in fact, so that the [G. Ed. p. 223.] short-ending bases in इ *i* and उ *u* may use at will either simple स् *s* or आस् *âs*; and instead of प्रीतेस् *prîtê-s*, तनोस् *tanô-s*, also प्रीत्यास् *prîty-âs*, तन्वास् *tanw-âs*, occur. The long vowels आ *â*, ई *î*, ऊ *û*,† have always आस् *âs*; hence, जिह्वायास् *jihwây-âs*, भविष्यन्त्यास् *bhavishyanty-âs*, वध्वास् *vadhw-âs*. This termination आस् *âs*, is, in Zend, according to §. 56ᵇ., sounded *åo*; hence, 𐬵𐬌𐬰𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬃 *hizvay-åo*, 𐬠𐬎𐬱𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬃 *bushyaìnty-åo*. In bases in 𐬌 *i* and 𐬎 *u* I have not met

---

* Hence I deduce the genitives 𐬠𐬭𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬯 *brâtar-s*, 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬀𐬭𐬯 *dughdhar-s*—which cannot be quoted—and the probability that the corresponding Sanskṛit forms are properly *bhrâtur*, *duhitur*, which cannot be gleaned from the Sanskṛit alone, on account of §. 11., and by reason of the elsewhere occurring euphonic interchange of *s* and *r*. भ्रातुर् *bhrâtur*, and similar forms, would therefore stand for *-urs*, and this apparently for *ars*, through the influence of the liquids; and, according to §. 94., they would have lost the genitive sign. The same is the case with the numeral adverb चतुर् *chatur*, "four times," for चतुर्स् *chaturs*; for which the Zend, by transposing the *r*, gives 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬯 *chathrus* (§. 44.). The Indian Grammarians also, in the genitives under discussion, assume the absence of the genitive sign (Laghu-Kaumudî, p. 35). As, however, the Visarga, in क्रोष्टु *krôshṭu* (from the theme क्रोष्टर् *krôshṭar* or क्रोष्टृ *krôshṭṛi*, see §. 1.), may evidently stand as well for *s* as for *r*; so in such doubtful cases it is of no consequence to which side the Indian Grammarians incline, where arguments are not found in the Sanskṛit itself, or in the cognate languages, which either confirm or refute their statements. And it is impossible, if the Visarga, in भ्रातुः *bhrâtuḥ*, stands for *r*, that the preceding *u* can be a transposition of the final letter of the base (ऋत उत्), for this cannot be both retained in the form of *r*, and yet changed into *u* (cf. Colebrook, p. 55, Rem.)

† Only the few monosyllabic words make an exception. (Gramm. Crit. §. 130.)

with the relative base य *ya.* Here follows a general view of the genitive formation:*

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vṛika-sya,*	*vĕhrka-hê,*	λύκο-ιο,	. . . .	*wilkō,*	*vulfi-s.*
m.	*ka-sya,*	*ka-hê,*	. . . .	*cu-jus,*	*kō,*	*hvi-s.*
f.	*jihwây-âs,*	*hizvay-âo,*	χώρᾱ-ς,	*terrā-s,*	*rankô-s,*	*gibô-s.*
m.	*patê-s,*	*patôi-s,*	. . . .	*hosti-s,*	. . . .	† *gasti-s.*
	paty-us,	. . . .	πόσι-ος,	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*prîtê-s,*	*âfrîtôi-s,*	. . . .	*siti-s,*	. . . .	† *anstai-s.*
	prîty-âs,	. . . .	φύσε-ως,	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*bhavishyanty-âs,*	*bûshyainty-âo,*	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
m.	*sûnô-s,*	*paśeu-s,*	. . . .	. . . .	*sunaù-s,*	*sunau-s.*
	. . . .	*paśv-ô,*	ἰχθύ-ος,	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*tanô-s,*	*taneu-s,*	. . . .	*socrū-s,*	. . . .	*handau-s.*
	tanw-âs,	*tanv-ô,*	πίτυ-ος,	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*vadhw-âs,*	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
m. f.	*gô-s,*	*geu-s,*	βο(F)-ός,	*bov-is,*	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*nâv-as,*	. . . .	νᾱ(F)-ός,	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*vâch-as,*	*vâch-ô,*‡	ὀπ-ός,	*voc-is,*	. . . .	. . . .
m.	*bharat-as,*	*barĕnt-ô,*§	φέροντ-ος,	*ferent-is,*	. . . .	‖ *fiyand-is.*
m.	*âtman-as,*	*aśman-ô,*‡	δαίμον-ος,	*sermon-is,*	*ákmen-s,*	*ahmin-s.*
n.	*nâmn-as,*	*nâman-ô,*‡	τάλαν-ος,	*nomin-is,*	. . . .	*namin-s.*

[G. Ed. p. 226.]

---

* The meanings will be found in §. 148.

† See §. 193.

‡ See p. 163. Note ‡.

§ And 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬙𐬋 *baratô* also may occur, according to the analogy of 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬀𐬙𐬋 *bĕrĕzatô*, "*splendentis*," V. S. p. 87, and *passim*. The retention of the nasal in the genitive, however, as in all other cases, is the more common form, and can be abundantly quoted. For 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬋 *barĕntô*, also 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬋 *barantô*, is possible, and likewise, in the other cases, the older 𐬀 *a* for 𐬆 *ĕ*. In some participles, as in 𐬟𐬱𐬎𐬫𐬀𐬧𐬯 *fsuyańś* (nom.), which is of constant recurrence as the usual epithet of agriculture (𐬬𐬀𐬉𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬀 *vaiśtrya*) 𐬆 *ĕ* never occurs.

‖ Vide §. 254. p. 302, Note ‡.

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*bhrâtur,*	*brâtar-s,**	*πατρ-ος,*	*fratr-is,*	. . . .	*brôthr-s.*
f.	*duhitur,*	*dughdhar-s,*†	*θυγατρ-ός,*	*matr-is,*	*dugter-s,*	*dauhtr-s.*
m.	*dâtur,*	*dâtar-s,*	*δοτῆρ-ος,*	*datōr-is,*	. . . .	. . . .
n.	*vachas-as,*	*vachaṇh-ô,*‡	*ἔπε(σ)-ος,*	*oper-is,*	. . . .	. . . .

THE LOCATIVE.

195. This case has, in Sanskṛit and Zend,§ *i* for its character, and in Greek and Latin‖ has received the function of the dative, yet has not suffered its locative [G. Ed. p. 227.] signification to be lost; hence, *Δωδῶνι, Μαραθῶνι, Σαλαμῖνι, ἀγρῷ, οἴκοι, χαμαί*; and, transferred to time, *τῇ αυτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτί.* So in Sanskṛit, दिवसे *divasê,* "in the day;" निशि *niśi,* "in the night."

196. With अ *a* of the base preceding it, the locative इ *i* passes into ए *ê* (§. 2.), exactly as in Zend; but here, also, 𐬋𐬌 *ôi* stands for 𐬉 *ê* (§. 33.); so that in this the Zend approaches very closely to the Greek datives like *οἴκοι, μοί,* and *σοί,* in which *ί* has not yet become subscribed, or been replaced by the extinction of the base vowel. To the forms mentioned answers 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬜𐬌𐬌𐬋𐬌 *maidhyôi,* "in the middle.' One must be careful not to regard this and similar phenomena as shewing a more intimate connexion between Greek and Zend.

197. In Lithuanian, which language possesses a proper locative, bases in *a* correspond in this case in a remarkable manner with the Sanskṛit and Zend, since they con-

---

* It would be better to read *brâthr-ô,* after the analogy of *dâthr-ô,* "*creatoris.*" (Burnouf, "Yaçna," p. 363, Note).

† The gen. of *dúghdar* is probably *dughdĕr-ô* (see p. 194, Note †).

‡ See p. 163, Note ‡.

§ Few cases admit of being more abundantly quoted in Zend than the locative, with which, nevertheless, Rask appears to have been unacquainted at the time of publishing his treatise, as he does not give it in any of his three paradigms.

‖ I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanskṛit dative, rather than to the locative; see p. 1227 G. Ed., Note †.

tract this *a* with the old locative *i*, which appears pure nowhere any more, to *è*; hence, *diewè*, "in God," from *DIEWA*, answers to देवे *dêvê*, 𐬛𐬀𐬉𐬬𐬉 *daêvê*. The bases which terminate with other vowels employ, however, in Lithuanian, without exception, *ye* as the locative termination, without any accent upon the *e*, a circumstance which must not be overlooked. This *e* is, perhaps, only an unorganic echo, which has occasioned the change of the old locative *i* into *y*, as, in Zend, the plural locative termination *su*, by adding an *a*, appears, for the most part, in the form of 𐬱𐬬𐬀 [G. Ed. p. 228.] *shva*, or 𐬵𐬬𐬀 *hva*. To the Lithuanian *ye* answers also, in old Sclavonic, a locative termination *ye*, for which several declensions have the original pure *i*; so that *nebes-i*, "in Heaven," and *imen-i*, "in the name," agree most strictly with the Sanskrit नभसि *nabhas-i* and नामनि *nâman-i*, from नभस् *nabhas*, नामन् *nâman*.

198. Masculine bases in *i* and *u*, and, optionally, feminine bases also, have a different locative termination in Sanskrit, viz. औ *âu*, before which इ *i* and उ *u* are dropped; but in पति *pati*, "lord," and सखि *sakhi*, "friend," the *i* has remained in its euphonic change to य् *y*: hence, पत्यौ *paty-âu*, सख्यौ *sakhy-âu*. If we consider the vocalization of the *s* to *u*, shewn in §. 56^b., and that, in all probability, in the dual, also, औ *âu* has proceeded from आस् *âs* (§. 206.); moreover, the circumstance that in the Vêdas the genitive occurs with a locative meaning (दक्षिणायास् *dakshiṇâyâs*, "*in dexterâ*," for दक्षिणायाम् *dakshiṇâyâm*, Pânini VII. 1. 39.); and, finally, the fact that, in Zend, masculines in *i* and *u* likewise employ genitive terminations with a locative signification; we shall be much disposed to recognise in this औ *âu*, from आस् *âs*, a sort of Attic or produced genitive termination.

199. In *u* bases, instead of the locative the Zend usually employs the genitive termination 𐬋 *ô* (from अस् *as*), while, in a genitive meaning, the form 𐬈𐬎𐬱 *eu-s* is more common; thus we read, in the Vend. S. p. 337., 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬌 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬬𐬋 𐬫𐬀𐬝 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬙𐬌 *aêtahmi aṇhvô yaṭ astvainti*, "*in*

hoc mundo quidem existente." This Zend termination *ô* (from $a+u$) has the same relation to the Sanskrit *âu* that a short *a* has to a long *a*, and the two locative terminations are distinguished only by the quantity of the first member of the diphthong. On the other hand, we find in the feminine base 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎 *tanu*, "body," very often the genuine locative form 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬬𐬌 *tanv-i*; and we do not doubt that, in Sanskrit also, originally the *u* bases of the [G. Ed. p. 229.] three genders admitted in the locative the termination *i* (सुन्वि *sunw-i*, तन्वि *tanw-i*, मध्वि *madhw-i*, or मधुनि *madhu-n-i*). Bases in 𐬌 *i* employ, in the locative, the usual genitive termination *ôi-s;* thus, in the Vend. S. p. 234, 𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬌 𐬥𐬀𐬨𐬁𐬥𐬉 𐬫𐬀𐬝 𐬨𐬁𐬰𐬛𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬳𐬥𐬋𐬌𐬯 *ahmi namânê yaṭ mâzdayaśnôis*, "*in hac terra quidem mazdayasnica*, which Anquetil renders by "*dans le pays des mazdeïesnans*." In pronouns, also, though they have a locative, the genitive sometimes occurs with a locative meaning; *e. g.* Vend. S. p. 46, 𐬀𐬌𐬢𐬵𐬉 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬉 *ainhê vîsê*, "in this way," or "place," (cf. the feminine form 𐬀𐬌𐬢𐬵𐬃 *ainhâo*, §. 172. Note.).

200. From the Zend and Sanskrit we have already been compelled to acknowledge a connexion between the genitive and locative; and as we have seen the locative replaced by the genitive, so must we, in Latin, recognise a replacing of the genitive by the locative. Through the formal agreement of the corresponding Latin and Sanskrit termination, and from the circumstance that the genitive occurs with a locative meaning only in the two first declensions (*Romæ, Corinthi, humi*), not in the third or in the plural (*ruri* not *ruris*), M. Prof. Rosen was first induced to characterize the Latin genitive of the two first declensions as borrowed from the old locative; a view, the correctness of which I do not doubt, and which I have already corroborated elsewhere by the genitives of the two first persons, in which *mei tui*, agree most surprisingly with मयि *mayi* (from *mê-i*, §. 2.), "in me," त्वयि *twayi* (from *twê-i*). Or ought, perhaps, a double inflexion *i* to be assumed as the sign of both a genitive and

a locative dative? Should *Romæ* (from *Romai*), *Corinthi*, be on one occasion genitives and on another locatives, and [G. Ed. p. 230.] in their different meaning be also of different origin? And where, then, would the origin of the genitive *Romæ* be found, as that of the locative has been found already? Should *mei*, *tui*, be compared, not with मयि *mayi*, त्वयि *twayi*, μοί, τοί, but with मम *mama*, तव *tava*, μοῦ, τοῦ, Goth. *meina*, *theina*? As the cases, like their substitutes the prepositions, pass easily from one relation of space to another, and, to use the expression, the highest become the lowest, nothing appears to me more probable, than that, after the first declension had lost its *ā-s*, then the dative, according to its origin a locative, necessarily became substituted for the genitive also.* In the second declension the form *o-i*, which belongs to the dative locative, corresponding to the Greek ῳ, οι—and of which examples still remain handed down to us (as *populoi Romanoi*)—has become doubly altered: either the vowel of the base alone, or only that [G. Ed. p. 231.] of the termination, has been left, and the first form has fixed itself in the dative, and the latter in the genitive, which is therefore similar to the nom. plural, where, in like manner, *Romani* stands for *Romanoi.* But the dative is not universally represented in Latin by a locative termination; for in the pronouns of the two first persons *mihi* answers to मह्यम् *ma-hyam,* from *ma-bhyam,* and *tibi* to तुभ्यम् *tu-bhyam;* as, however, the league between the dative and locative had been once concluded, this truly dative termination occurs with a locative meaning (*ibi, ubi*), while *vice versâ,* in Sanskṛit, the locative very frequently supplies the place of the dative, which latter, however, is most usually expressed by the genitive, so that the proper dative is, for the most part, applied to denote the causal relation.

---

* The assumption that a rejected *s* lies at the base of the genitives in *i*, *ae* (*a-ī*) appears to me inadmissible, because in all other parts of Grammar—numerous as the forms with a final *s* otherwise are—this letter has in Roman defied all the assaults of time, and appears everywhere where the cognate languages lead us to expect it: no *terræ* for *terras* (acc. pl.), no *lupi* for *lupos*, no *amæ* for *amas*, &c. The question is not here that of an occasional suppression of the *s* in old poets, before a consonant in the word following. The genitives in *e-s* and *æ-s* occurring in inscriptions (*provincie-s*, *suæ-s*, see Struve, p. 7.) appear to be different modes of writing one and the same form, which corresponds to the Greek η-ς for ā-ς; and I would not therefore derive the common genitive *suæ*—older form *suai*—from *suæs* with the *s* dropped. The genitives in *us*, given by Hartung (p. 161.) from inscriptions in Orelli (*nomin-us*, *exercitu-us*, *Castor-us*, &c.), I am not surprised at, for this reason, that generally *us* is, in Latin, a favourite termination for अस् *as*; hence *nomin-us* has the same relation to नाम्नस् *nâmn-as*, that *nomin-i-bus* has to नामभ्यस *nâma'-bhyas*, and *lupus* to वृकस् *vṛika-s*.

201. Pronouns of the 3d person have, in Sanskṛit, इन् *in* instead of *i* in the locative, and the अ *a* of the appended pronoun स्म *sma* is elided (see §. 165.); hence, तस्मिन् *tasm'in,* "in him"; कस्मिन् *kasm'in,* "in whom?" This *n,* which seems to me to be of later origin, as it were an *n* ἐφελκυστικόν, does not extend to the two first persons, and is wanting in Zend also in those of the third; hence, 𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬌 *ahmi,* "in this." As to the origin of the *i* signifying the place or time of continuance, it is easily discovered as soon as *i* is found as the root of a demonstrative; which, however, like the true form of all other pronominal roots, has escaped the Indian Grammarians.

202. Feminine bases ending with long simple vowels have, in Sanskṛit, a peculiar locative termination; viz. आम् *âm,* in which, also, the feminines in short *i* and *u* may at will participate (cf. §. 192.); while the monosyllabic feminine bases in long ई *î* and ऊ *û,* for आम् *âm,* admit also the common इ *i;* hence, भियाम् *bhiy-âm* or भियि *bhiy-i,* "in fear," from भी *bhî.** In Zend this termi- [G. Ed. p. 232.]

---

* Perhaps the termination *âm* is a corruption of the feminine genitive termination *âs* (cf. §. 198. दक्षिणायास् *dakṣhiṇâyâs* for *dakṣhiṇâyâm*), where it should be observed that in Prâkṛit, as in Greek, a final *s* has frequently become a nasal.

nation *âm* has become abbreviated to *a* (cf. §. 214.); hence, 𐬫𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬫𐬀 *yahmy-a*, "in which," from 𐬫𐬀𐬵𐬨𐬍 *yahmî* (cf. §. 172.). This termination appears, however, in Zend, to be less diffused than in Sanskṛit, and not to be applicable to feminines in 𐬌 *i* and 𐬎 *u*. The form *tanwi* is clearly more genuine than the Sanskrit *tanâu*, although from the earliest period, also, *tanwâm* may have existed.

203. We here give a general view of the locative, and of the cases akin to it in Greek and Latin (see §. 148.):

[G. Ed. p. 233.]

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.
m.	*vṛikê,**	*vĕhrkê,**	λύκῳ,	*lup'-ī,*	*wilkè.*
f.	*jihwây-âm,*	*hizvay-a,*	χώρᾳ,	*terra-i,*	*ranko-ye.*
m.	*paty-âu,*†	. . . .	πόσι-ῐ,	*host'-ī,*	*páti-ye.*
f.	*prît'-âu,*‡	. . . .	πόρτι-ῐ,	*sit'-ī,*	*awi-ye.*
f.	*bhaviṣhyanty-âm,*	*bûshyainty-a,*	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
m.	*sûn'-âu,*	. . . .	ἰχθύ-ι,	*pecu-ī,*	*sunu-ye.*
f.	*tan'-âu,*§	*tanw-i,*	πίτυ-ι,	*socru-ī,*	. . . .
n.	*madhu-n-i,*	. . . .	μέθυ-ι,	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*vadhw-âm,*	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
m. f.	*gav-i,*	*gav-i,*	βο(Ϝ)-ί,	*bov-ī,*	. . . .
f.	*nâv-i,*	. . . .	νᾱ(Ϝ)-ί,	. . . .	. . . .
m.	*bharat-i,*	*barĕnt-i,*	φέροντ-ι,	*ferent-ī,*	. . . .
m.	*âtman-i,*	*aṡmain-i,*	δαίμον-ι,	*sermon-ī,*	. . . .
n.	*nâmn-i,*	*nâmain-i,*	τάλαν-ι,	*nomin-ī,*	. . . .
m.	*bhrâtar-i,*	*brâthr-i?*‖	πατρ-ί,	*fratr-ī,*	. . . .
f.	*duhitar-i,*	*dughdhĕr-i?*	θυγατρ-ί,	*matr-ī,*	. . . .
m.	*dâtar-i,*	*dâthr-i?*‖	δοτῆρ-ι,	*datōr-ī,*	. . . .
n.	*vachas-i,*	*vacaṇh-i,*	ἔπε(σ)-ι,	*oper-ī,*	. . . .

---

* See §. 196. † See §. 198. ‡ Or *prîty-âm.* § Or *tanw-âm.*

‖ The rejection of the *a* preceding the *r* in the theme seems to me more probable than its retention. The *i* of the termination is guaranteed by the other consonantal declension, which in this case we can abundantly enough exemplify. (Regarding *dughdhĕr-i*, see p. 194, Note †). That in Sanskrit *bhrâtar-i, duhitar-i, dâtar-i,* are used instead of *bhrâtri,* &c. is contrary

to

VOCATIVE.

204. The vocative in the Sanskṛit family of languages has either no case-sign at all, or is identical with the nominative: the former is the principle, the latter the practical corruption, and is limited in Sanskṛit to monosyllabic bases terminating in a vowel: hence, भीस् *bhî-s* "fear!" as κί-ς. A final *a* of the nominal [G. Ed. p. 234.] bases remains, in Sanskṛit and Zend, unchanged; in Lithuanian it is weakened to *e*; and the Greek and Latin also, in the uninflected vocative of the corresponding declension, prefer a short *e* to *o* or *u*, which, under the protection of the terminations, appears as the final letter of the base. We must avoid seeing in λύκε, *lupĕ*, case terminations: these forms have the same relation to वृक *vṛika* that πέντε, *quinque*, have to पञ्च *pancha*; and the old *a*, which appears in λύκος as *o*, in *lupus* as *ŭ*, has assumed the form of *ĕ* without any letter following it. In Zend, the consonantal bases, when they have *s* in the nominative, retain it in the vocative also; thus, in the present participle we have frequently found the form of the nominative in the sense of the vocative.

205. Bases in *i* and *u* have, in Sanskṛit, Guna; neuters, however, have also the pure vowel: on the other hand,

---

to the theory of the weakest cases (§. 130.), to which in other respects the locative belongs. As, however, bases in अर् *ar* (ऋ *ṛi*), with respect to the rejection and lengthening of the *a*, have a very great agreement with bases in *an*, it must here be further remarked, that these too, in the locative, do not strictly follow the suppression of the *a* in the weakest cases, which is conditionally prescribed in §. 140., but optionally retain the *a*, or reject it; so that with *nâmn-i* also *nâman-i* is used. With *brâtar-i*, however, exists no *bhrâtr-i*, and the form *pitr-i*, given at §. 132. is an oversight: the Greek πατρ-ί may therefore, with respect to the shortening of the base, be better compared with the dative *pitr-ê*.

polysyllabic feminines in *î* and *û* shorten this final vowel; while a final आ *â*, by the commixture of an *i*, becomes *ê* (§. 2.). The language, however, both by producing and shortening the final vowel, clearly aims at one and the same end, only by opposite ways; and this end, in fact, is a certain emphasis in the address. To the Guna form ओ *ô*, from *a*+*u*, correspond remarkably the Gothic and Lithuanian; as *sunau, sunaù*, resembling the Sanskṛit सूनो *sûnô*,* Gothic feminine bases in *i* do not occur in [G. Ed. p. 285.] Ulfilas in the vocative: as, however, they, in other respects, run parallel to the *u* bases, the vocative *anstai*, from *ANSTI*, might be expected as an analogous form to *handau*. The Lithuanian *i* bases in the vocative extend their theme in the same manner as in the genitive (§. 193.); so that, properly, there is no vocative of this class of words, and *awie* answers to *zwáke, giesme* (Ruhig's third declension), for *zwákie, giesmye*.† Masculine bases, in Gothic, in *i*, like the masculine and neuter *a* bases, have lost their final vowel in the vocative, just as in the accusative and nominative; hence *vulf', daur', gast'*. In bases in *n* the Gothic shares with the Latin the suppression of the final consonant, which has passed over from the nominative to the vocative; while only the Sanskṛit and Zend again introduce into the vocative the nasal which had been dropped in the nominative. Adjectives in German, with respect to the vocative, have departed from the old path, and retain the case-sign of the nominative; hence Gothic *blind's*, "blind!" In Old Northern, substantives also follow this irregular use of the nominative sign. The Greek has preserved a tolerable number of its vocatives pure from the nominative sign, and in some classes of words uses the bare base, or that abbreviation of it which the laws of euphony or effeminacy rendered requisite; hence, τάλαν opposed to τάλας, χαρίεν for χαρίεντ' opposed to χαρίεις, παῖ for παιδ' opposed to παῖς. In guttural and labial bases the language has not got free of the nominative sign in the vocative, because κς and πς (ξ, ψ) are very favourite combinations, to which the alphabet also has paid homage by particular letters to represent them. Still the [G. Ed. p. 236.] vocative ἄνα, together with ἄναξ, is remarkable, and has that sound which might be expected from a theme ἄνακτ', to which, in its uninflected state, neither κτ, nor, conveniently, even the κ, could be left. "For the rest it is easy to imagine (says Buttmann, p. 180), that particularly such things as are not usually addressed, prefer, when they happen to be addressed, to retain the form of the nominative, as ὦ ποῦς!" * The Latin has followed still farther the road of corruption in the vocative which was prepared by the Greek, and employs in its place the nominative universally, except in the masculine second declension. The substantive bases mentioned in §. 148. form, in the vocative,

---

* The Zend can at will attach Guna to a final 𐬎 *u*, or not; and we find both 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬋 *mainyô* and 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬎 *mainyu* as the vocative of 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬎 *mainyu*, "spirit." On the other hand, we have found a final 𐬌 *i* only, without Guna; and indeed frequently 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *paiti*, "lord." So Vend S. p. 456, 𐬎𐬯𐬌𐬵𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬀 𐬥𐬀𐬨𐬂𐬥𐬋 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *usihista namânô-paiti*, "Arise, lord of the place!" The 𐬌 *i* between the preposition and the verb serves as a conjunctive vowel, to assist the juncture of the words (cf. §. 150. Note).

† It follows from this, and from §. 193., that (§. 177.) I have incorrectly assumed *ei* as the termination in the dative. For *áwi-ei*, the division should be made thus, *áwie-i*; and this is analogous with *zwáke-i, giesme-i*, for *zwákie-i, giesmye-i*.

---

* To this circumstance may also the re-introduction of the case-sign in the neuter be owing, while the Sanskṛit employs the bare base. Moreover, this fact also may have co-operated towards the Greek more easily freeing itself in the vocative from the bare primary form, because it appears at the beginning of compounds much more rarely than in Sanskṛit. (See §. 112.)

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vṛika,*	*vĕhrka,*	λύκε,	*lupe,*	*wilke,*	*vulf'.*
n.	*dâna,*	*dâta,*	δῶρο-ν,	*donu-m,*	....	*daur'.*
f.	*jihwê,*	*hizvê?*	χώρα,	*terra,*	*ranka,*	*giba?*
m.	*patê,*	*paiti,*	πόσι,	*hosti-s,*	....	*gast'.*
f.	*prîtê,*	*âfrîti,*	πόρτι,	*siti-s,*	....	....
n.	*vâri,*	*vairi,*	ἴδρι,	*mare,*	....	....
f.	*bhavishyanti,*	*bûshyainti,*	....	....	....	....
m.	*sunô,*	*paśu,*	ἰχθύ,	*pecu-s,*	*sunaù,*	*sunau.*
f.	*tanô,*	*tanu,*	πίτυ,	*socru-s,*	....	*handau.*
n.	*madhu,*	*madhu,*	μέθυ,	*pecu,*	....	....
f.	*vadhu,*	....	....	....	....	....
m. f.	*gâu-s,*	*gâu-s,*	βοῦ,	*bo-s,*	....	....
f.	*nâu-s,*	....	ναῦ,	....	....	....
f.	*vâk,*	*vâc-s?*	ὄπ-ς,	*voc-s,*	....	....
m.	*bharan,*	*baraṅ-s,*	φέρων,	*feren-s,*	*sukaṅ-s,*	*fiyand.*
m.	*âtman,*	*aśman,*	δαῖμον,	*sermo',*	*âkmû',*	*ahma'.*
n.	*nâman,*	*nâman,*	τάλαν,	*nomen,*	....	*namô'.*
m.	*bhrâtar,*	*brâtarĕ,**	πάτερ,	*frater,*	....	*brôthar.*
f.	*duhitar,*	*dughdharĕ,**	θύγατερ,	*mater,*	*motė,*	*dauhtar.*
m.	*dâtar,*	*dâtare,**	δοτήρ,	*dator,*	....	....
n.	*vachas,*	*vachô,*	ἔπος,†	*opus,*	....	....

[G. Ed. p. 237.]

DUAL.

NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE.

206. These three cases have, in Sanskṛit, in the masculine and feminine, the termination औ *âu,* which probably arose from आस् *âs* by vocalization of the *s* (cf. §§. 56^b. and 198.), and is therefore only a stronger form of the plural termination *as.* The dual, both in the cases mentioned and in the others, prefers the broadest terminations, because it is based on a more precise intention than the indefinite

---

* See §. 44. † See §. 128.

plural, and needs, therefore, stronger emphasis, and more lively personification. Compare, also, in the neuter, the long *î* of the dual with the short *i* of the plural; as अश्रुणी *aśruṇî* with अश्रूणि *aśrûṇi.*

207. While the Prâkṛit and Pâli have lost [G. Ed. p. 238.] the dual, the Zend has retained it; still, however, so that instead of it the plural often occurs, and in the Vend. S., p. 203, 𐬁 𐬱𐬆𐬥𐬎𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀𐬱𐬗𐬌𐬙 *â schĕnubyaśchiṭ,* "and as far as the knees," is used with a plural termination. In the verb the dual is still more rare; but here, however, it is not entirely lost, and many examples of it can be quoted in the V. S.* The Sanskṛit termination औ *âu* occurs in the corresponding places in Zend in the form of 𐬃 *âo,* which, according to §. 56ᵇ., stands at the same time for the Sanskṛit termination आस् *âs,* and gives an emphatic proof that the Sanskṛit dual termination औ *âu* is nothing else than a corruption of आस् *âs,* and, in fact, an occasional one which appears in grammar only once or twice (see §. 198.), while the example herein given by the Sanskṛit has been raised to a general principle by the Zend. This principle becomes almost irrefragable matter of fact from the consideration that the Zend has even actually retained, in the dual, the sibilant before the particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha,* and uses *âoś-cha,* not *âo-cha,* as might have been expected if the dual termination औ *âu,* in Sanskṛit, were the original form, and not a corruption of आस् *âs.* Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 225, 𐬙𐬋𐬌 𐬎𐬠𐬀𐬉 𐬵𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬃𐬯𐬗𐬀 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬀𐬙𐬃𐬯𐬗𐬀 *tôi ubaê hurvâoś-cha amĕrĕtat-âoś-cha,* "the two Haurvats and Amertats."† What Anquetil, in his Voca- [G. Ed. p. 239.]

---

* Cf. Gramm. Crit. Add. to r. 137.

† Cf. Anquetil II. 175. The two Genii, which Anquetil writes *Khordad* and *Amerdad,* appear very frequently in the dual, also with the termination *bya* (§. 212.); and where they occur with plural terminations, this may be ascribed to the disuse of the dual, and the possibility of

replacing

bulary (p. 456), writes *naerekeïdo*, and renders by "*deux femmes*," can be nothing else than 𐬥𐬁𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬐𐬀𐬫𐬂 *nâirikay-âo*, from the base 𐬥𐬁𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬐𐬁 *nâirikâ*. The form 𐬥𐬁𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬐𐬀𐬫𐬂 *nâirikayâo* is, however, evidently more genuine than 𐬥𐬁𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬐𐬈 *nâirikê*; as, according to the Sanskrit principle (§. 213.), from a feminine base must have been formed *nâirikâ*. From 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬎 *bâzu*, Rask cites the form 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬎𐬂 *bâzvâo*, "arms," without remarking that it is a dual: it clearly belongs, however, to this number, which was to be expected referring to the arms; and 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬎 *bâzu* forms, in the nominative plural, 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬎𐬊 *bâzvô* or 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬊 *bâzavô*. Still, in the edited parts of the Zend-Avesta, examples are wanting of *bâzvâo*, regarding the genuineness of which, however, I have no doubt.

208. In the Vêda dialect, the termination औ *âu* occurs frequently abbreviated to *â*, so that the last element of the diphthong is suppressed. Several examples of this abbreviated form occur in Rosen's "Specimen"; as, अश्विना *aśvin-â*, "the two Aświns," from *aśvin*, and नरा *narâ*, "two [G. Ed. p. 240.] men," which can be derived both from *nar*

---

replacing the dual in all cases by the plural. Thus we read, l. c. p. 211, *haurvatât-ô* and *amĕrĕt-aś-cha* as accusative, and with the fullest and perhaps sole correct reading of the theme. We will, however, not dwell on this point any longer here, but only remark, that *haurvatât* is very frequently abbreviated to *haurvat*, and the *â* of *amĕrĕtât* is often found shortened; whence, p. 104, 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬀𐬙𐬠𐬫𐬀 *haurvaṭbya*, 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬀𐬙𐬠𐬫𐬀 *amĕrĕtaṭbya*, (see §. 38.); 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬀𐬙𐬀 𐬠𐬫𐬀 *amĕrĕtaṭa bya* is a palpable error. Undoubtedly, in the passage before us, for *hurvâoścha*, must be read either *haurvatâoścha*, or *haurvatâtâoścha*, or *haurvatatâoścha*. Compare l. c. p. 91, 𐬵𐬀𐬊𐬭𐬎𐬀𐬙𐬀𐬙𐬁𐬎𐬱𐬗𐬀 *haôrvatatâuś-cha* with the termination 𐬁𐬎𐬱 *âuś* for 𐬂𐬱 *âoś* (cf. §. 33.), but incorrectly 𐬊 *ô* for 𐬋 *ô*. The two twin genii are feminine, and mean apparently, "Entireness" and "Immortality." The forms preceding them, therefore, *tôi* and *ubaê*, are likewise feminine; the former for ते *tê* (§. 33.), the latter for उभे *ubhê* (cf. §. 28.). We must also regard the dual form mentioned at §. 45. of the so-called *Amschaspants* not as neuter, but as feminine.

(नृ *nṛi*) and from *nara*, but which more probably comes from *nar*. In Zend the abbreviated termination from *âu* is likewise employed, and, in fact, more copiously than the fuller termination; and we rejoice to see, in the Heaven of Ormuzd also, the twin pair called Indian, and celebrated for their youthful beauty. We read, namely, in Vend. S. p. 313, 𐬀𐬯𐬞𐬌𐬥𐬁𐬗𐬀 𐬫𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬋 𐬫𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬛𐬈 *aśpinâ-cha yavanô yaz (maidhê)*, "*Aśvinosque juvenes veneramur,*" which Anquetil renders by "*je fais Jzeschné à l'excellens toujours* (*subsistant*")*.* The Sanskrit अश्विना *aśvinâ* however, can, in Zend, give nothing but *aśpinâ* or *aśpina* (§. 50.): the former we owe here to the protecting particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha* (see p. 175, Note ‡ G. Ed.). The plural *yavan-ô* (from *yavanas*), referring to the dual *aśpinâ*, is worthy of remark, however (if the reading be correct), as it furnishes a new proof that, in the received condition of the Zend, the dual was near being lost: the verb being, for the most part, found in the plural when referring to nouns in the dual form.

209. From the Vêda termination *â*, and the short *a*,* which frequently stands for it in Zend, the transition is easy to the Greek ε, as this vowel, at the end of words, is a favourite representative of the old *ă*; and, as above, in the vocative (§. 204.), λύκε stood for वृक *vṛika*, 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬀 *vĕhrka*, so here, also, ἄνδρα (with euphonic δ) corresponds to the above-mentioned Vêda नरा *narâ*, and Zend 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nar-a*. Although, according to §. 4., ω also very frequently stands for आ *â*, still we must avoid regarding λύκω as the analogous form to वृका *vṛikâ*, or 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬁 *vĕhrkâ* (see §. 211.). That however, the Lithuanian dual *ů* of masculine [G. Ed. p. 241.] bases in *a* (in the nominative) is connected with the Vêda and Zend dual termination spoken of, *i. e.* has proceeded from *ā*, I

---

* Thus, Vendidâd Sâde, p. 23, 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬙𐬀 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬁𐬙𐬀 *haurvata amĕrĕtâta*, "the two Haurvats and Amertats"; p. 136, and frequently, 𐬛𐬎𐬀 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀 *dva nara*, "two men." Cf. Gramm. Crit. Add. to r. 137.

have the less doubt, because in the other declensions the Lithuanian dual also agrees in this case most strictly with the Sanskṛit, and the Lithuanian *u* or *ů* (*uo*) is, in some other places, equally the representative of an old *â* (see §. 162.); compare, *důmi*, or *důdu*, "I give," with ददामि *dadâmi*; *důsu*, "I will give," with दास्यामि *dâsyâmi*. And the monosyllabic pronominal bases also in *a* sound in the dual *ů*; thus *tů* = ता *tâ*, *ků* = *kâ*. We hold, therefore, the Vêda form वृका *vṛikâ*, the Zend 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬁 *vĕhrkâ*, and the Lithuanian *wilkù*, as identical in principle: we are, at least, much more inclined to this view of the matter than to the assumption that the *u* of *wilkù* is the last portion of the Sanskṛit diphthong औ *âu*, and that *wilkù* belongs to the form वृकौ *vṛikâu*. In the vocative the Lithuanian employs a shorter *u*, and the accent falls on the preceding syllable: thus *wilku*, opposed to *wilkù*, in which respect may be compared πάτερ opposed to πατήρ, and §. 205.

210. Masculine and feminine bases in *i* and *u* suppress, in Sanskṛit, the dual case termination औ *âu*, and, in compensation, lengthen the final vowel of the base in its uninflected form; thus, पती *patî*, from पति *pati*; सूनू *sûnû*, from सूनु *sûnu*. The 𐬠𐬁𐬰𐬬𐬁𐬊 *bâzv-âo*, "arms," (from *bâzu*) mentioned in §. 207., is advantageously distinguished from these abbreviated forms. The curtailed form is not, however, wanting in Zend also, and is even the one most in use. From 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬎 *mainyu*, "spirit," we frequently find the dual 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬏 *mainyû*: on the other hand, for 𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬏 *ĕrĕzû*, "two [G. Ed. p. 242.] fingers," we meet with the shortened form 𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬎 *ĕrĕzu*, which is identical with the theme (Vend. S. p. 318, 𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬎 𐬛𐬬𐬀 *dva ĕrĕzu*.

211. The Lithuanian, in its *i* and *u* bases, rests on the above-mentioned Sanskṛit principle of the suppression of the termination and lengthening of the final vowel: hence, *awì*, "two sheep" (fem.), answers to अवी *avî*, from अवि *avi*; and *sunù*, "two sons," to सूनू *sûnû*. On this principle rests

also the Greek dual of the two first declensions. If it be not desired entirely to remove the ω of λύκω from a Grecian soil, and banish it completely to India, it may be allowed to seek its origin, not in the long *a* of वृका *vṛikâ*, but in the short *ο* of the base, as the first declension has a long *α* in the dual, because its bases terminate with *α*, although in the common dialect this letter is very frequently represented by *η*. Or may it, perhaps, have happened, that, in the dual *α* of the first declension an ι subscribed has been lost, and thus τά for τᾷ would correspond to the Sanskrit ते *tê* (from *tâ*+*i* or *î*)? Be that as it may, still the dual has always the quality *α*, because it is comprehended in the base, and the ω of λύκω may be regarded as merely the lengthening of the *ο* of λύκο; for it must be assumed, that if the Sanskṛit *a* bases had preserved the short *α* in Greek, and वृकस् *vṛika-s* had become λύκα-ς, then the dual too would be λύκᾰ, and not λύκω.

212. Neuters have, in the Sanskṛit dual, for the termination of the cases under discussion, not औ *âu*, but *î*, as in the plural they have not *as* but short *i* (इ). A final अ *a* of the base with this ई *î* passes into ए *ê* (§. 2.); hence, शते *śatê*, "two hundred," from शतई *śata-î*: [G. Ed. p. 243.] other vowels interpose a euphonic *n*; hence, तालुनी *tâlu-n-î*, "two palates." In Zend I can quote the neuter dual only in the *a* bases; as, for example, we frequently find 𐬯𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬉 *ṡaitê* (§. 41.), answering to the Sanskṛit शते *śatê*; and 𐬛𐬎𐬫𐬉 𐬵𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬣𐬭𐬉 *duyê hazaṇrê*, "two thousand," (§. 43.) for द्वे सहस्रे *dwê sahasrê*.

213. The Greek has renounced a termination distinguishing the neuter from the two natural genders; but the Sanskṛit appears to have extended the neuter *î* mentioned above also to the feminine *â* bases. But the coincidence of the feminine form जिह्वे *jihwê*, "two tongues," from जिह्वा *jihwâ*, with the neuter दाने *dânê*, "two gifts," is, as the Zend instructs us, only external, and the two forms

meet in quite different ways, and have such a relation to one another, that in *dânê*, from *dâna* + *î*, a dual termination, and, in fact, the usual one of neuters, is actually contained; but in जिह्वे *jihwê* the masculine-feminine termination *âu* (from *âs*, §. 206.) is lost, but can, however, be again restored from the Zend form 𐬥𐬁𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬐𐬀𐬫𐬃 *nâirikay-âo*, "two women." I believe, that is to say, that जिह्वे *jihwê* has arisen or been corrupted from जिह्वयौ *jihway-âu** in such a manner, that after the termination has been dropped, the preceding semi-vowel has returned to its vowel nature, and has become a diphthong with the *â* of the base (see §. 2. and cf. p. 121 G. ed.). The dual *jihwê*, therefore, like the Gothic singular dative *gibai* (§. 161.) would have only an apparent termination, *i.e.* an extension of the base which originally accompanied the real case termination. In Zend, however, the abbreviated feminine dual form in 𐬉 *ê* likewise occurs (§. 207. Note†), and is, indeed, the prevalent one; but it is [G. Ed. p. 244.] remarkable, and a fair and powerful confirmation of my assertion, that even this abbreviated form in 𐬉 *ê*, where the appended particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha* stands beside it, has preserved the case sign *ś*; and, as above, 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬀𐬙𐬃𐬱𐬗𐬀 *amĕrĕtat-âoś-cha*, "the two Amertats," so we find, Vend. S. p. 58, 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬥𐬙𐬉 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬴𐬉𐬱𐬗𐬀 *amĕsheś-cha śpĕntê*, "and two Amshaspants" ("non-conniventesque sanctos," cf. अमिष *amisha* and Nalus V. 25, 26. and see §. 50.).† The form 𐬉𐬱 *ês* is to be deduced from the full form 𐬀𐬫𐬃𐬱 *ay-âoś*; so that, after dropping the 𐬃 *âo*, the preceding *ay* must have been contracted to *ê*, just as (p. 121

---

* Cf. the dual genitive and locative जिह्वयोस् *jihway-ôs*.

† The MS. has here 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬱𐬈𐬱𐬗𐬀 *amĕśeścha*, but 𐬈 frequently occurs in the place of 𐬉, although, as it appears, through an error. Cf. l. c. p. 88, 𐬀𐬊𐬎𐬉 𐬫𐬀𐬯𐬥𐬋 𐬀𐬨𐬈𐬱𐬉 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬥𐬙𐬈 *aovê yaśnô ameśê śpĕnte*; and see §. 51.

G. Ed.) in Prâkṛit, एमि *êmi* has arisen from the Sanskṛit अयामि *ayâmi*, by rejecting the *â*. We may support the derivation of जिह्वे *jihwê* from जिह्वयौ *jihway-âu*, by this circumstance, also, that in the Vêda dialect the feminine *î* bases may lose the dual termination *âu*, and then display the naked base; thus, in the scholia to Pâṇini, वाराही उपानहौ *vârâhî upânahâu*, "boar-leather shoes," for वाराह्यौ *vârâhyâu*. It is very remarkable, that even this Vêda form, only one example of which can be quoted, can be referred to the Zend language. We find, frequently, 𐬙𐬈𐬬𐬍𐬱𐬍 *tevîshî* applied to feminine dual substantives (*e.g.* Vend. S. p. 225.); and I infer that its theme ends with a long, not a short *i*, from the frequently-occurring plural accusative 𐬙𐬈𐬬𐬍𐬱𐬍𐬯 *tevîshîs* (Vend. S. pp. 99, 102).*

214. To the Sanskṛit-Zend feminine dual [G. Ed. p. 245.] forms in *ê* answer the Lithuanian in *ì*, as *rankì*, from *RANKĀ*; so that of the diphthong ए *ê* only the last element is left. The Lithuanian forms the accusative dual, in contradistinction to the cognate languages, according to the analogy of the singular, by a ringing nasal, *e.g. witkuṅ*. The Latin has preserved only in *duo* and *ambo* a remnant of the dual corresponding to the Greek, which, however, in the oblique cases, is replaced by plural terminations. Here follows a general view of the nominative, accusative, and vocative dual (see §. 148.).

---

* It is perhaps a participle of the reduplicated pret., according to the analogy of the Sanskṛit तेनिवस् *tênivas*, fem. तेनुषी *tênuṣhî* (Gramm. Crit. §. 603.); and indeed, from the root 𐬙𐬀𐬬 *tav*, "to be able," it may signify "powerful, strong." The 𐬈 *e* for 𐬉 *ê* is explained by the influence of the 𐬬 *v*. And 𐬎𐬙𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬏𐬌𐬙𐬍 *utayûitî* also is an adjective feminine dual; but I am unable to quote examples of the other cases of this word, from which to learn whether 𐬍 *î* or 𐬌 *i* is its final vowel.

[G. Ed. p. 246.] [G. Ed. p. 247.]

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LITHUANIAN.
m.	*vṛikâu,*	*vĕhrkâo,*	....	....
	vṛikâ,	*vĕhrkâ,**	λύκω,	N. *wilkù,* V. *wílku.*
n.	*dânê,*	*dâtê,*	δώρω,	....
f.	....	*hîzvay-âo,*	....	....
	jihwê,	*hizvê,*	χώρᾱ,	N. *rankì,* V. *ránki.*
m.	*patî,*	*paiti?*	πόσι-ε,	N. *patì,* V. *páti.*
f.	*prîtî,*	*âfrîtî?*	πόρτι-ε,	N. *awì,* N. *áwi.*
n.	*vâri-ṇ-î,*	....	ἴδρι-ε,	...

---

* While consonantal bases occur in the dual both with a long and a short *a*, the *a* bases, contrary to the practice otherwise adopted of shortening a final *â*, exhibit in the nom. acc. dual, for the most part, the original long vowel. I deduce this, among other words, from the so-called *Amshaspants*, which, together with the feminine form noticed at §. 207. Note †., are found also as masculine; *e g.* Vend. S. pp. 14. 30, 31, &c.: 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬱𐬀 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬀 𐬵𐬎𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬀 𐬵𐬎𐬛𐬃𐬢𐬵𐬋 𐬁𐬌𐬌𐬈𐬯𐬉 *amĕshâ spĕntâ hucsathrâ hudâoṇhô âyêśê,* "I glorify the two Amshaspants (*non conniventesque sanctos*) the good rulers, who created good." If *amĕsha spĕntâ* and *hucsathrâ* were plural forms, the final *a* would be short, or at least appear much more frequently short than long; while, on the contrary, these repeatedly recurring expressions, if I mistake not, have everywhere a long *a*, and only in the vocative a short *a* (Vend. S. p. 67. Cf. §. 209.). That the epithet *hudâoṇhô* is in the plural cannot incur doubt, from the dual nature of the *Amshasp* (cf. §. 208.): this resembles, to a certain degree, the use of adjective genitives referring to a substantive in the ablative, which was mentioned in §. 180. We find, also, the forms *ameshâo-spĕntâo* (Vend. S. p. 313.), which indeed might also be feminine plural forms, but shew themselves only as masculine duals, in the same meaning as the so frequent *ameshâ spĕntâ.* We find also, frequently, 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬧𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬀 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬎 *śpĕnistâ mainyû,* "the two most holy spirits" (p. 80), through which the dual form in *â* of bases in *a* is likewise confirmed in the most unequivocal manner. The answer to the query, Whether generally only two *Amshaspants* are to be assumed? whether the genitive plural (*ameshananm spĕntananm*), and sometimes also the accusative plural, is only the representative of the dual, which is very uncertain and shaken in its use? whether under the name *Amshaspants*, perhaps, we should always understand the Genii *Haurvat* (*Khordad*) and *Amertat*

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LITHUANIAN.
f.	*bhavishyanty-âu,*	*bûshyaintî,*	....	....
m.	*sûnû,*	*paśû,*	*ἰχθύ-ε,*	N. *sunù,* V. *súnu.*
f.	*tanû,*	*tanû,*	*πίτυ-ε,*	....
m.	*madhû-n-î,*	....	*μέθυ-ε,*	....
f.	*vadhw-âu,*	....	....	....
m. f.	*gav-âu,**	....	*βό(Ϝ)-ε,*	....
f.	*nâv-âu,*	....	*νᾶ(Ϝ)-ε,*	....
f.	*vâch-âu,*	*vâch-âo,*	....	....

Amertat, and whether these two Genii, according to the principle of the Sanskrit copulative compounds, have the dual termination for this reason alone, that they are usually found together, and are, together, two? whether, in fine, these two twin-genii are identical with the Indian Aświnen, which were referred in §. 208. to the Zend-Avesta? The reply to all these queries lies beyond the aim of this book. We will here only notice that, Vend. S. pp. 80 and 422, the Genii *Haurvat* and *Amertat*, although each is in the dual, still are, together, named 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬥𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬁 𐬨𐬀𐬌𐬥𐬌𐬌𐬏 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬛𐬁 𐬙𐬆𐬎𐬍𐬱𐬌 *śpĕnistâ mainyû mazdâ tevîshi*, &c., "the two most holy spirits, the great, strong." As Genii, and natural objects of great indefinite number, where they are praised, often have the word *viśpa*, "all," before them, it would be important to shew whether "all *Amshaspants*" are never mentioned; and the utter incompatibility of the *Amsh.* with the word *viśpa* would then testify the impassable duality of these Genii. If they are identical with the celestial physicians, the Indian Aświnen, then "Entireness" and "Immortality" would be no unsuitable names for them. In Pâṇini we find (p. 803) the expressions मातरपितरौ *mâtara-pitarâu* and पितरमातरा *pitara-mâtarâ* marked as peculiar to the Vêdas. They signify "the parents," but, literally, they probably mean "two mothers two fathers," and "two fathers two mothers." For the first member of the compound can here scarcely be aught but the abbreviated dual *pitarâ, mâtarâ;* and if this is the case, we should here have an analogy to the conjectured signification of *haurvât-a* and *amĕrĕtât-a.*

* Bases in ओ *ô* form the strong cases (§. 129.) from औ *âu*; those in अन् *an*, and nouns of the agent in तर् *tar*, lengthen in those cases, with the exception of the vocative singular, the last vowel but one (see §. 144.).

[G. Ed. p. 248.]

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LITHUANIAN.
	*vâch-â,**	*vâch-a,*	ὄπ-ε,	....
m.	*bharant-âu,*	*barant-âo,*	....	....
	bharant-â,	*barant-a,*	φέροντ-ε,	....
m.	*âtmân-âu,*†	*aśman-âo,*	....	....
	âtmân-â,	*aśman-a,*	δαίμον-ε,	N. V. *ákmen-u.*
n.	*nâmn-î,*	....	τάλαν-ε,	....
m.	*bhrâtar-âu,*	*brâtar-âo,*	....	....
	bhrâtar-â	*brâtar-a,*	πατέρ-ε,	....
f.	*duhitar-âu,*	*dughdhar-âo,*	....	....
	duhitar-â,	*dughdhar-a,*	θυγατέρ-ε,	....
m.	*dâtâr-âu,*†	*dâtâr-ao,*	....	....
	dâtâr-â,	*dâtâr-a,*	δοτῆρ-ε,	....
n.	*vachas-î,*	....	ἔπε(σ)-ε,	....

INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE, ABLATIVE.

215. These three cases have in the Sanskrit and Zend dual a common termination; while in Greek the genitive has joined itself to the dative, and borrowed its termination from it. It is in Sanskrit भ्याम् *bhyâm,* which in Zend has been abbreviated to 𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 *bya.* Connected with the same is, first, the termination भ्यम् *bhyam,* which, in the pronoun of the two first persons, denotes the dative singular and plural, but in the singular of the first person has become abbreviated to ह्यम् *hyam* (§. 23.). This abbreviation appears, however, [G. Ed. p. 249.] to be very ancient, as the Latin agrees

---

* The Vêda duals in *â* are as yet only cited in bases in *a, n,* and *ar* (ऋ, §. 1.); however, the Zend leads us to expect their extension to the other consonantal declensions, as also the circumstance that, in other parts of grammar, in the Vêdas *â* is occasionally found for *âu,* and other diphthongs; *e.g.* नाभा *nâbhâ,* as locative for नाभौ *nâbhâu,* from नाभि *nâbhi,* "navel."

† See the marginal note marked (*), p. 229.

remarkably with it; and *mi-hi* corresponds to मह्यम् *ma-hyam*, as *ti-bi* does to तुभ्यम् *tu-bhyam*. In the second place, भ्यस् *bhyas*, which expresses the dative and ablative plural, is pronounced in Zend *byô* (§. 56^{b}.), in Latin *bus*, suppressing the *y*, and with the usual change of *as* into *us*. The Lithuanian has *mus* for *bus* in the dative plural (§. 63.): this more complete form has, however, remained only in the pronoun of the two first persons, where *mu-mus*, "*nobis*," *yu-mus*, "*vobis*," are used as well as *mu-m's*, *yu-m's*; while in all other words we find simply *ms* as the sign of the dative—*wilka-ms*, &c. In the dual dative the Lithuanian has only the *m* of the Sanskṛit termination भ्याम् *bhyâm*, as *wilka-m*. This *m* is, however, not the final letter of *bhyâm*, but the initial labial, *b*, in a nasal form (§. 63.)*: to me, at least, it appears improper to regard this dual termination otherwise than that of the cognate plural case; and I have no doubt of the identity of the *m* of *wilka-m*, λύκοιν, with that of *wilka-ms* (for *wilka-mus*), λύκοις. According to this explanation, therefore, the German plural dative corresponds to the Lithuanian dual dative, *vulfa-m*, *gasti-m*, *sunu-m*.†

216. A third form related to the dual termination भ्याम् *bhyâm* is भिस् *bhis*, as sign of the instrumental plural. This termination which is in Zend 𐬠𐬍𐬱 *bîs*, [G. Ed. p. 250.]

---

* On the facile transition of *v* into *m* (cf. p. 114) rests also, I doubt not, the connexion of the termination युवाम् *yuvâm*, "ye two," आवाम् *âvâm*, "we two," with the common termination *âu*, before vowels *âv*, which in the pronouns spoken of has stiffened into *âm*, and in this form has remained even before consonants. Whether the case is the same with the verbal third dual person ताम् *tâm* shall be discussed hereafter.

† Cf. Grimm, I. 828. 17, where the identity of the Lithuanian-German inflection *m* with the *b* (*bh* of the older languages) was first shewn. When, however, Grimm, l. c., says of the Lithuanian that only the pronouns and adjectives have *ms* in the dative plural, the substantives simply *m*, this is perhaps a mistake, or the plural is named instead of the dual; for Ruhig gives *ponams*, "*dominis*," *akims*, "*oculis*," &c.

(also 𐬠𐬌𐬯 *bis*), has in Latin fixed itself in the dative and ablative,* which must together supply the place of the instrumental; while in Lithuanian, with the exchange of the labial medial for the nasal of this organ (§. 63.), *mis* is the property of the instrumental alone, so that *puti-mis* answers to पतिभिस् *pati-bhis*, 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬠𐬍𐬯 *paiti-bîs*.

217. I have already elsewhere affirmed, that the Greek termination *φι*, *φιν*, is to be referred to this place,† and what is there said may be introduced here also. If *φιν*, and not *φι*, be assumed to be the elder of the two forms, we may offer the conjecture that it has arisen from *φις*, following the analogy of the change of *μες* into *μεν* in the 1st person plural, which corresponds to the Sanskṛit *mas* and Latin *mus*‡; *φις* would correspond to the Sanskṛit *bhis* and Latin *bis*, in *nobis*, *vobis*. Perhaps, also, there originally existed a difference between *φι* and *φιν* (which we find used indifferently for the singular and plural), in that the former may have belonged to the singular, the latter to the plural; and they may have had the same relation to one another that, in Latin, *bi* has to *bis* in *tibi* and *vobis*; and that, in Lithuanian, *mi* has to *mis* in *akimi*, "through the eye," and *akimis*, "through the eyes." It has escaped notice that the terminations *φι* and [G. Ed. p. 251.] *φιν* belong principally to the dative: their locative and instrumental use—*ἀυτόφι*, *θύρηφι*, *βίηφιν*—is explained by the fact, that the common dative also has assumed the sign of these relations. The strict genitive use of the termination *φι*, *φιν*, may perhaps be altogether denied; for if prepositions, which are elsewhere used in construction with the

---

* In the 1st and 2d pronoun (*no-bis*, *vo-bis*), where *bis* supplies the place of the *bus* which proceeds from भ्यस् *bhyas*.

† Trans. Berlin Academy, 1826. Comparison of Sanskṛit with its cognate languages, by Prof. Bopp. Essay III. p. 81.

‡ Observe, also, that the Sanskṛit instrumental termination *bhis* has been, in Prâkṛit, corrupted to हिं *hiṅ*.

genitive, occur also with the case in φι, φιν, we are not compelled, on this account, to regard the latter as the genitive or representative of the genitive. In general, all prepositions, which are used in construction with the genitive, would, according to the sense, be better used with an ablative or a locative, if these cases were particularly represented in Greek. The suffix θεν also, of genuine ablative signification, expressing separation from a place, is incorrectly considered to represent the genitive termination, where the latter, in the common dialect, has received the sign of the lost ablative. In ὄσσε δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, δακρυόφιν would, in Sanskṛit, be rendered by अश्रुभिस् *aśrubhis*: the relation is entirely instrumental, and is not changed because the verb mentioned is more usually, though less suitably, used with the genitive. The same is the case with ὄσσε δακρυόφιν τέρσαντο. In Ἰλιόφι κλυτὰ τείχεα it is not requisite to make Ἰλιόφι governed by τείχεα, but it may be regarded as locative "*to Ilium.*" And in Od. XII. 45. (πολὺς δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφιν θὶς ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων) there is no necessity to look upon ὀστεόφιν as the genitive, for it can be aptly rendered by *ossibus*. I know no passages besides where a genitive meaning could be given to forms in φι and φιν. To the accusative, likewise, the form φι, φιν, is foreign, and according to its origin does not suit it; nor does it appear in the train of prepositions, which elsewhere occur with the accusative, with the single exception of ἐς ἔννηφιν in Hesiod (cf. Buttmann, p. 205). As to the opinion [G. Ed. p. 252.] of the old Grammarians, that φι, φιν, may stand also in the nominative and vocative, and as to the impropriety of the ι subscribed before this termination in the dative singular of the first declension, we refer the reader to what Buttmann (p. 205) has rightly objected on this head.

218. The neuters in Σ, mentioned in §. 128., are nearly the only ones from bases ending with a consonant, which occur in combination with φι, φιν, in forms like ὄχεσ-φι,

ὄρεσ-φι, στήθεσ-φιν, which have been misunderstood, because the Σ dropped before vowel terminations was not recognised as the property of the base. Of the other consonants, *ν* is the only one, and ΚΟΤΥΛΗΔΟΝ the only *ν* base, which occurs in combination with *φιν*; and since N does not combine with Φ so readily as Σ, it assumes an auxiliary vowel *ο*—*κοτυληδόν-ο-φιν*—after the analogy of compound words like *κυν-ο-θαρσής*. This example is followed, without the necessity for it however, by *δάκρυ*—*δακρυόφιν*; while *ναῦ-φιν*, in an older point of view, resembles exactly the Sanskṛit नौभिस् *nâubhis;* for in compounds, also, the base ΝΑΥ keeps free from the conjunctive vowel *ο*, on which account *ναύσταθμον* may be compared with Sanskṛit compounds like नौस्थ *nâu-stha*, "standing (being) in the ship."

219. But to return to the Sanskṛit dual termination भ्याम् *bhyâm*, it is further to be remarked, that before it a final अ *a* is lengthened; hence, वृकाभ्याम् *vṛikâbhyâm* for वृकभ्याम् *vṛikabhyâm*. It hardly admits of any doubt, that this lengthening extended to the cognate plural termination भिस् *bhis;* and that hence, from वृक *vṛika* also *vṛikâ-bhis* would be found. The common dialect has, however, abbreviated this form to वृकैस् *vṛikâis*, which is easily derived from *vṛikâbhis* by rejecting the *bh*; for ऐ *âi* is, according [G. Ed. p. 253.] to §. 2., $= \hat{a} + i$. This opinion, which I have before expressed,* I can now support by new arguments. In the first place, which did not then occur to me in discussing this question, the pronouns of the two first persons really form from their appended pronoun स्म *sma, smâ-bhis*; hence अस्माभिस् *asmâbhis*, युष्माभिस् *yuṣhmâbhis*; which forms stand in the same relation to the वृकाभिस् *vṛikâ-bhis*, assumed by me, that the accusatives अस्मान् *asmân*, युष्मान् *yuṣhmân*, do to वकान् *vṛikân*, "*lupos*." Secondly, the opinion

---

* Trans. Berlin Academy, 1826. Comparison of Sanskṛit with its cognate languages, by Prof. Bopp. Essay III. p. 79.

which I arrived at theoretically has, since then, been so far practically established by the Vêda dialect, that, in it, from a final अ *a* not *â-bhis* but *ê-bhis*, has been formed, according to the analogy of the dative and ablative, as वृकेभ्यस् *vrikêbhyas;* hence, अश्वेभिस् *aśvêbhis,* "*per equos,*" from अश्व *aśva.* In the common dialect the pronominal form एभिस् *ê-bhis* "*per hos,*" answers to this Vêda form, which must properly be derived from the pronominal base अ *a,* which generally plays the chief part in the declension of इदम् *idam.* Though, then, on one side, from the pronoun अ *a* springs the form एभिस् *ê-bhis;* on the other side, from अस्म *asma* and युष्म *yushma* proceed the forms अस्माभिस् *asmâbhis,* युष्माभिस् *yushmâbhis;* and though the Vêda dialect, in its substantive and adjective bases in *a,* attaches itself to the former form, still no necessity hence arises for supposing the abbreviated *âis* to be based on an *ê-bhis,** as that could never lead to *âis.* Perhaps, however, *âbhis* might become *êbhis,* either through the assimilative force of the *i* of *bhis,* or through analogy to [G. Ed. p. 254.] the dative *ê-bhyas,* the *ê* of which may, in like manner, owe its origin to the re-active influence of the य् *y.*†

220. The Prâkrit has fully followed out the path commenced by the Vêda dialect, and changed into ए *ê* the *â* of

---

* From *êbhis* would come, after rejecting the *bh,* not *âis,* but *ayis,* for *ê,* $=a+i$, cannot be combined with a following *i* into a diphthong, or, as it is itself already a diphthong, into a triphthong.

† I do not regard the Vêda नद्यैस् *nadyâis,* for नदीभिस् *nadî-bhis,* as an abbreviation of *nadî-bhis* (for after rejecting the *bh,* from *nadî+is* would be formed *nadîs*), but as a very common instrumental, for which an extension of the base *nadî* to *nadya* is to be assumed. On the other hand, the Zend pronominal instrumental *dîs* mentioned by Burnouf (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III. 310.) may here be considered, which occurs frequently in the Jzeshne, and is probably an abbreviation of 𐬛𐬌𐬠𐬌𐬯 *dibis* or 𐬛𐬌𐬠𐬍𐬯 *dibîs,* from a base *di,* the accusative of which 𐬛𐬌𐬨 *dim,* "him," is often found with *i* unlengthened, contrary to §. 64. The connection of the base 𐬛𐬌 *di* with 𐬙𐬀 *ta* cannot, on this account, be disputed.

asmâ-bhis, yuṣhmâ-bhis, as also, in the locative plural, that of *asmâsu, yuṣhmâsu;* hence अम्हेहिं *amhê-hiṅ,* तुम्हेहिं *tumhê-hiṅ,* अम्हेसु *amhêsu,* तुम्हेसु *tumhêsu.* Moreover, in Prâkṛit, all other *a* bases, as well pronouns as substantives and adjectives, terminate the instrumental plural with एहिं *e-hiṅ*; and thus कुसुमेहिं *kusumê-hiṅ,* "*floribus,*" (from *kusuma,*) answers to the Vêda कुसुमेभिस् *kusumê-bhis.* Before, however, the forms in एभिस् *ê-bhis,* एहिं *ê-hiṅ,* had arisen, from आभिस् *âbhis,* by the change of *â* into *ê, âis* must have proceeded by means of rejection and contraction from that most early form. This form exists also in the oldest hymns of the Vêdas, together with that in एभिस् *êbhis*: thus, in Rosen, p. 14, यज्ञैस् *yajnâis*; pp. 15 and 21 अर्कैस् *arkâis.* In Zend the abbreviated form *âis* is the only one that occurs, which it does, indeed, extremely often.

221. Before the dual termination 𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 *bya* the Zend, in [G. Ed. p. 255.] its *a* bases, differs from the Sanskṛit in the same way as the Zend and Prâkṛit do before the termination भिस् *bhis,* हिं *hiṅ*; it employs, namely, *ê* for *â*: but from *vĕhrkê-bya,* according to §§. 28. 41. comes *vĕhrkaêibya.* Thus, in the Vendidâd, 𐬓𐬀𐬉𐬌𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 𐬞𐬁𐬜𐬀𐬉𐬌𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 *hvaêibya pâdhaêibya,* "*suis pedibus,*" = स्वाभ्याम् पादाभ्याम् *swâbhyâm pâdâbhyâm;* 𐬰𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀𐬉𐬌𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 *zaśtaêibya* (हस्ताभ्याम्) "*manibus.*" But in this case, also, the diphthong ए *ê* is supplied by *ôi* (§. 33.); *e.g.* 𐬎𐬠𐬋𐬌𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 *ubôibya,* "*ambobus*" (Vend. S. p. 305.). If in this form the lost nasal be restored, and it be assumed (of which I have no doubt) that the Greek dual termination *ιν* is an abbreviation of the Sanskṛit *bhyâm*;* then the Homeric forms like *ὤμοι-ϊν* are to be compared with the 𐬎𐬠𐬋𐬌𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬀 *ubội-bya*

---

* By rejecting the labial, as in वृकैस् *vṛikâis* from वृकाभिस् *vṛikâbhis,* and by contracting the याम् *yâm* to *ιν*, as when, in Sanskṛit, for *yaṣhta, iṣhta* is said, from *yaj,* "to sacrifice," and in Zend 𐬍𐬨 *îm,* "*hæc,*" for इयम् *iyam* (see, also, §. 42.).

above mentioned; where, therefore, the first *ι* would fall to the base, which it lengthens, the other to the termination. The third declension, by its forms like *δαιμόν-οιν*, might give rise to the conjecture, that *οιν* and not *ιν* is the true termination: the latter, however, is shewn to be so from the two first declensions, where *ιν* and not *οιν* is attached to the final vowel of the base (Μούσα-ιν, λόγο-ιν). In the third, therefore, we explain the *ο* before *ιν* in the same manner as, §. 218. before *φιν* (*κοτυληδον-ό-φιν*); viz. as a conjunctive vowel, which has made its way from the bases which necessarily have it, *i. e.* from those terminating in a consonant into those which might dispense with it (into the bases in *ι* and *υ*); as, in general, in the third declension the consonantal bases have given the tone, and have shewn the way to the vowels *ι* and *υ*. It might, however, not [G. Ed. p. 256.] have been necessary for the conjunctive vowel *ο* to make its appearance between consonants and the termination, as *δαιμον-ιν* could very easily be uttered; but the *ο* of *δαιμόνοιν* comes evidently from a time when the *ιν* was still preceded by the consonant, which the corresponding Sanskṛit termination *bhyâm* leads us to expect; in all probability a *φ*; thus, *δαιμόν-ο-ιν*, from *δαιμον-ο-φιν*.* We should have, therefore, here a different *φιν* from that which, in §. 217., we endeavoured to explain from *φις*, भिस् *bhis:* the nasal in the dual (*φ*)*ιν* stands quite regularly for its predecessor *m*, as, in general, at the end of words. In order to present to our view still more clearly how forms quite similar take root in the language as corruptions of preceding dissimilar forms, let the form ἔτυπτον be considered as the first person singular and third person plural; in one case from ἔτυπτομ, in the other from ἔτυπτοντ.

---

* The conjunctive vowel *ο*, therefore, before the dual termination *ιν*, has an origin exactly similar to that of the possessive suffix *εντ*, which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskṛit वन्त् *vant*. Εντ must therefore have been originally pronounced *Ϝεντ*; and the conjunctive vowel, which the digamma made requisite or desirable before consonantal bases, and which, from thence, has extended itself to the whole third declension, has remained also after the digamma has been dropped, and thus *πυρ-ό-εις* answers to *πυροῖν*, from *πυρ-ο-ϊν*: on the other hand, *τυρό-εις* to *τύροιν* (*τυρο-ϊν*).

222. If the dual termination ιν be explained as a contraction of *bhyâm*, we shall have found, also, the origin of the dative plural termination ιν, which appears to have been changed in this number in the pronouns of one gender as it were by accident (ἡμ'-ῖν, ὑμ'-ῖν, σφ'-ίν, together with σφί-σι). The Greek, however, in this respect, is guided or misled by the Sanskṛit; or, more correctly, the distinction of the plural dative of the pronouns of one gender is very ancient, and the Sanskṛit has in them भ्यम् *bhyam* as termination (अस्मभ्यम् *asma-bhyam*, "*nobis*," युष्मभ्यम् *yuṣhma-bhyam*, (G. Ed. p. 257.) "*vobis*"), opposed to the भ्यस् *bhyas* of all other words. From this *bhyam*, then, we arrive at ιν quite as easily, or more so, than from the dual termination *bhyâm* (cf. §. 42.). As, however, भ्यम् *bhyam*, and its abbreviated form ह्यम् *hyam*, according to §. 215., has also its place in the singular dative of the pronouns of one gender, but occurs nowhere else; as, moreover, the Latin also, in the pronouns referred to, has maintained a genuine dative termination, and to the common *i*, which is borrowed from the locative, presents in contrast the termination *bi* or *hi* (for *bhi*) (§. 200.); we can, therefore, in the singular ιν also of ἐμ'-ίν, τε-ΐν, τ'-ίν, ἵν, σφ'-ίν, see nothing else than an abbreviation of भ्यम् *bhyam*, a form which the Latin and Greek have shared in such a manner, that the former has retained the beginning and the latter the end. In the *i* both coincide.* The occasional accu-

---

* A short time since, Max. Schmidt, in his excellent treatise "Commentatio de Pronomine Græco et Latino" (p. 77), endeavoured to connect the termination ιν here treated of with the Sanskṛit in a different way, by designating it as the sister form of the pronominal locative termination

sative use of this termination, in Theocritus, is to be explained from its original signification being no longer felt, and the exchange of its *ν* with that of the accusative thereby caused. On the other hand, we have in *μίν* and *νίν* real accusatives, and should therefore divide them *μί-ν*, *νί-ν*; and not assume, with Buttmann (p. 296), a connection between this form and the dative *-ῑν*.

223. As to the origin of the case-suffixes [G. Ed. p. 258.] भिस् *bhi-s*, भ्यम् *bhy-am*, भ्याम् *bhy-âm*, and भ्यस् *bhy-as*, which begin with भ्य् *bhy* (from भि *bhi*), we must notice, first, their connection with the preposition अभि *abhi*, "to," "towards," "against," (whence अभितस् *abhi-tas*, "at," cf. "*apud*"): However, in *abhi* itself *bhi* is clearly, in like manner, the termination, and the demonstrative अ *a* the theme; so that this preposition, in respect to its termination, is to be regarded as a sister form to the Latin *ti-bi*, *si-bi*, *i-bi*, *u-bi*;* just as another preposition, which springs from the pronominal base *a*, viz. अधि *adhi*, "over," finds analogous forms in the Greek locatives, like *ὅ-θι*, *ἄλλο-θι*, *οὐρανό-θι* (§. 16.). Related to the suffix धि *dhi* is ध *dha*, which has been retained in the common dialect only in the abbreviation *ha*, in *i-ha*, "here," and in the preposition *sa-ha*, "with"; but in the Vêda dialect exhibits the original form and more extended diffusion, and in the Zend, also, is found in several pro-

---

mination इन् *in* (§. 201.). In this view similar forms would be contrasted, exclusive of the length of the Greek *ιν*, which, according to my explanation, may pass as compensation for the *a*, which has been dropped. Still I lay less stress on the difference of quantity than on this, that it is precisely the pronouns of one gender in the Sanskrit, which exhibit in the locative not *in* but the common *i* (§. 201.), but I attach still more weight to what has been said above in support of my opinion.

* In Prâkṛit the termination हिं *hiṅ*, which is connected with भि *bhi* (cf. §. 217.), unites also with other pronominal bases, for the formation of locative adverbs, as तहिं *ta-hiṅ*, "there," कहिं *ka-hiṅ*, "where?"

nominal bases with a locative signification; *e.g.* 𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬜𐬀 *ava-dha*, "here." In the Greek, compare *θα* of *ἔνθα*, opposed to *θεν*, from *ἔνθεν*, *ἐμέθεν*, &c., from धस् *dhas*, for तस् *tas*, in अधस् *a-dhas*, "beneath": in which formations ध् *dh* stands as a permutation of *t*, and occurs in this way, also, in some other formations.* Therefore *dha*, *dhi*, are to be derived from the demonstrative base त *ta*; but it is more difficult to trace the origin of the भि *bhi* of अभि *abhi* (Greek *ἀμφί*). I suspect that an initial consonant has been [G. Ed. p. 259.] dropped. As in Greek, also, *φίν* is used for *σφίν*, and as in Sanskṛit विंशति *vinśati* "twenty," is clearly an abbreviation of द्विंशति *dwinśati*, and in Zend 𐬠𐬍𐬱 *bîs*, "twice," 𐬠𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬀 *bitya*, "the second," is used for 𐬛𐬬𐬍𐬱 *dvîs*, (Sanskṛit द्विस् *dwis*), 𐬛𐬬𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬀 *dvitya* (Sanskṛit द्वितीय *dwitîya*), so भि *bhi* may be identical with the pronominal base स्व *swa* or स्वि *swi*—whence the Greek *σφεῖς*, *σφίν*, *φίν*, &c.; and so indeed, that after the *s* has been dropped, the following semi-vowel has been strengthened or hardened, just as in the Zend 𐬠𐬍𐬱 *bîs*, 𐬠𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬀 *bitya*, and the Latin *bis*, *bi*. The changed sibilant might also be recognised in the aspiration of the भ् *bh*, as, in Prâkṛit (§. 166.), स्म *sma* has become म्ह *mha*; and, (which comes still closer to the case before us), in Greek for *σφίν* is found also *ψίν*. And, in Sanskṛit, that भ् *bh* should spring from $b+h$ is not entirely unknown; and in this way is to be explained the relation of भूयस् *bhûyas*, "more," to बहु *bahu*, "much," the *a* being rejected (Gramm. Crit. r. 251. Rem.).

224. The following will serve as a general view of the dual termination under discussion, in Sanskṛit, Zend, Greek, and Lithuanian:—

---

* Among others, in the 2d person plural of the middle ध्वे *dhwê* and ध्वम् *dhwam* for त्वे *twê*, त्वम् *twam*.

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LITHUANIAN.
m. *vṛikâ-bhyâm,*	*vĕhrkaêi-bya,* or *vĕhrkôi-bya,*	λύκο-ιν,	*wilka-m.*
f. *jihwâ-bhyâm,*	*hizvâ-bya,*	χώρα-ιν,	*ranko-m.*
m. *pati-bhyâm,*	*paiti-bya,*	ποσί-ο-ιν,	*pati-m.*
f. *tanu-bhyâm,*	*tanu-bya,*	πιτύ-ο-ιν,	....
f. *vâg-bhyâm,*	*vâch-e-bya,**	ὀπ-ο-ῖν,	....
m. *bharad-bhyâm,*	*baran'-bya,*	φερόντ-ο-ιν,	....
m. *âtma'-bhyâm.*†	*aśma'-bya,*	δαιμόν-ο-ιν,	....

[G.Ed. p. 260.]

---

* I deduce this form principally from the base 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗 *raoch*, "light," which often occurs in the terminations beginning with 𐬠 *b*, and always interposes 𐬈 *e* as conjunctive vowel—𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *raoch-e-bîs*, 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬫𐬋 *raoch-e-byô*. We find, also, 𐬬𐬍𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *vî-vach-e-bîs* (Vend. S. p. 63.). Bases in 𐬭 *r* interpose 𐬆 *ĕ*; those in 𐬙 *t*, when a vowel precedes that letter, conjoin the termination direct (𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬙𐬠𐬫𐬀 *amĕrĕtâtaṭ-bya*, according to §. 38.): on the other hand, the 𐬙 *t* of 𐬥𐬙 *nt* is rejected; thus, V. S. p. 9. 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬆𐬧𐬠𐬫𐬀 *bĕrĕzĕn'-bya*, "*splendentibus*," with 𐬧, contrary to §. 60. The form 𐬠𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬝 𐬠𐬫𐬄𐬨 *brvaṭ-byaṅm*, "*superciliis*," also deserves notice, because in this solitary word the case termination appears unreduced (§. 61.). The MS., however, as often as this word occurs, always divides the termination from the base (Vend. S. p. 269, twice, 𐬠𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬝 𐬠𐬫𐬄𐬨 *brvaṭ byaṅm*; pp. 321 and 322, 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬝 𐬠𐬫𐬄𐬨 *barvaṭ byaṅm*, probably for *bravaṭ byaṅm*; so that it would seem that 𐬠𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬝 *brvaṭ* is the ablative singular of a theme 𐬠𐬭𐬏 *brû* (Sansk. भ्रू *bhrû*). I have not found this word in any other case: it is not likely, however, that any thing but 𐬠𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬙 *brvat* or 𐬠𐬭𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬙 *brvant* is its theme: in the latter case it would be a participial form, and would demonstrate, that instead of the last consonant of *nt*, the last but one also may be rejected. Or are we to regard *brvaṭ byaṅm* as a form of that singular kind that unites with the termination of the ablative singular that of the dual, and thus 𐬠𐬭𐬏 *brû* would still be the theme?

† *N*, in Sanskrit and Zend, is rejected before case terminations beginning with a consonant; thus, in Greek, δαίμο-σι, and in Gothic *ahma'-m*.

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LITHUANIAN.
m.	*bhrâtṛi-bhyâm,*[*]	*bhrâtar-ĕ-bya,*	πατέρ-ο-ιν,	....
n.	*vachô-bhyâm,*[†]	*vachô-bya,*	ἐπέ(σ)-ο-ιν,	....

GENITIVE, LOCATIVE.

[G. Ed. p. 261.] 225. These two cases, in Sanskṛit, have the common termination ओस् *ôs*, which may be connected with the singular genitive termination. The following are examples: वृकयोस् *vṛikay-ôs*, जिह्वयोस् *jihway-ôs* (cf. §. 158.), पत्योस् *paty-ôs*, तन्वोस् *tanw-ôs*, वाचोस् *vâch-ôs*, भ्रात्रोस् *bhrâtr-ôs*, वचसोस् *vachas-ôs*. In Zend this termination seems to have disappeared, and to be replaced by the plural; likewise in Lithuanian, where, *awy-û* is both dual and plural genitive.

PLURAL.

NOMINATIVE, VOCATIVE.

226. Masculines and feminines have, in Sanskṛit, अस् *as* for the termination of the nominative plural, with which, as in the cognate languages, the vocative is identical in all declensions. I consider this *as* to be an extended form of the singular nominative sign *s*; so that in this extension of the case-suffix lies a symbolical allusion to plurality: and the *s*, which is too personal for the neuter, is wanting in that gender, in the singular and dual, as well as in the plural. The three numbers, therefore, with regard to their masculine-feminine termination or personal designation, are related to one another, as it were, like positive, comparative, and superlative, and the highest degree belongs to the dual. In Zend अस् *as* has, according to §. 56^b.

---

[*] अर् *ar* before case terminations beginning with consonants is shortened to ऋ *ṛi* (§. 127.).

[†] See §. 56^b.

become *ô* or 𐬀𐬱 *aṡ* before the appended particles *cha* and *chit*; the Greek exhibits ες, under the restriction of §. 228.; the Latin *ēs*,* with unorganic length of quantity through the influence of the *s*; the Lithuanian has *ės* in bases in *r* but elsewhere simple *s*. Thus the words दुहितरस् *duhitar-as*, 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬱𐬗𐬀 *dughdhar-aṡ-cha*, θυγατέρ-ες, *dukter-ės*, *matr-es*, correspond with one another.

227. The *a* of the termination is melted [G. Ed. p. 262.] down with a preceding अ *a* of the base to *â*; thus, वृकास् *vṛikâs*, from *vṛika* + *as*, corresponds to the Gothic *vulfôs*, from *VULFAas* (§. 69.). In this concretion only, however, with the vowel of the base, the Gothic has preserved the full termination; but elsewhere, both with vowel and consonantal bases, the *s* alone of the old *as* is left, as in general the termination *as* in Gothic polysyllabic forms has everywhere been weakened to *is* or *s* (cf. §§. 135. 191.): hence, *sunyu-s*, *ahman-s*, for *suniv-as*, *ahman-as*. And आ *â*, too, is contracted with the termination *as* to *âs*; hence, जिह्वास् *jihwâs*, for *jihwâ-as*. It cannot, however, be shewn with certainty, from what has been just said, that the Gothic *gibôs*, from *GIBŌ*, has simple *s* or *as* (contracted with the base vowel to *ô*=*â*) for its case designation.

228. The masculine pronominal bases in *a* refuse, in Sanskṛit, Zend, and Gothic, the full nominative designation, and in place of it extend the base by the addition of an *i*, which, according to §. 2., with the *a* of the base forms ए *ê*,† for which, in Zend, is used 𐬉 *ê* or 𐬊𐬌 *ôi*;

---

* Vide §. 797. p. 1078.

† As अ *a* is lengthened in many other cases to ए *ê*, and with this the case terminations are then first conjoined, there is good ground to assume that in ते *tê*, and similar forms, no case designation at all is contained, and that the pronouns, as purely words of personality, find themselves sufficiently personified in this case through themselves alone; as in the singular *sa* is said for *sas*, in Sanskṛit as in Gothic, and in Greek ὁ for ὅς; while in Latin, with *is-te* also *ipse* and *ille* are robbed of the nominative sign. This opinion is remarkably confirmed by the fact that अमी *amî* (Grimm. Crit.

hence, Sanskrit ते *tê*, Zend 𐬙𐬉 *tê*, Gothic *thai*, "this," [G. Ed. p. 263.] answering to the feminine form तास् *tâs*, 𐬙𐬁𐬋 *tâo* (§. 56^b.), *thôs*. To this corresponds, in Greek, *τοί* (Doric for *οἱ*). In Greek and Latin, however, this *i*, which practically replaces the termination *as* (*ες*, *ēs*), has not remained in the masculine pronominal bases in *o* (= अ *a*, §. 116.); but all other bases of the second, as of the first declension, have, in Greek and Latin, taken example from it; hence, *λύκοι*, *χῶραι*, for *λυκο-ες*, *χωρα-ες*, *lupi* (from *lupoi*), *terræ* (from *terrai*), for *lupo-es*, *terra-es*. The Latin fifth declension, although in its origin identical with the first (§. 121.), has preserved the old termination; hence, *rēs* from *rē-ēs*, as, in Sanskrit *jihwâs* from *jihwâ-as*. The Lithuanian has fixed narrower restrictions than the Greek and Latin on the misuse of the pronominal inflexion under discussion, or, to speak more correctly, want of inflexion: it gives, indeed, *wilkai*=*λύκοι*, *lupi*, but not *rankai*, but *rankos*. Honour, therefore, to the Gothic! that in this respect it has not overstepped by one hair the old Sanskrit-Zend limits; for that the adjective *a* bases, as they in general follow the pronominal declension, give also *ai* for *ôs* (*blindai* "*cæci*") is, therefore, no violation of the old law.

229. In Zend, in consonantal bases the dual termination 𐬁𐬋 *âo* also (from आस् *âs*, §. 207.) occurs with a plural signification; thus, frequently, 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬁𐬋 *vâch-âo*, "*voces*," 𐬎𐬑𐬜𐬁𐬋

Crit. §. 271.) shews itself clearly through most of the oblique cases, as *amî-byas*, "*illis*," *amî-shâm*, "*illorum*," to be the naked theme. The form which occurs in the Zend-Avesta 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬞𐬉𐬱𐬗𐬀 *vîspês-cha*, "*omnesque*" (V. S. p. 49), considered as a contraction of *vîspay-as-cha* (cf. §. 244.), leads to the conjecture, that to ते *tê*, and similar uninflected forms, the termination *as* also might attach itself; thus, तयस् *tay-as*. In Zend, the pronominal form in *ê* occurs, for the most part, in the accusative plural; and thus the abovementioned *vîspês-cha* l. c. stands probably as accusative, although, according to Anquetil's inaccurate translation, it might be regarded as the nominative.

raoch-âo, "*luces*," which forms cannot be regarded, perhaps, as regular plurals of bases in *â*; for I believe [G. Ed. p. 264.] I can guarantee that there exists no such base as 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬁 *vâchâ* and 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬁 *raochâ*. The form 𐬁𐬊𐬧𐬵𐬋 *âoṅhô* in *a* bases, as 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬁𐬊𐬧𐬵𐬋 *vĕhrkâoṅhô*, "*lupi*," and "*lupos*," rests on that in the Vêdas, but which only occurs in the nominative, आसस् *âsas* (§. 56^{b}.); *e.g.* स्तोमासस् *stômâsas*, "songs of praise," for स्तोमास् *stômâs*, from स्तोम *stôma*.*

230. Bases in *i* and *u* have, in Sanskrit, Guna; hence पतयस् *patay-as*, सूनवस् *sûnaw-as*, for *paty-as*, *sûnw-as*. The Gothic also has preserved this Guna, but in its weakened form *i* (§. 27.), which, before *u*, becomes *y*; hence, *sunyu-s*, "sons," (for *suniu-s*, from *sunau-s*,) a form which would be unintelligible without the Guna theory, which has been shewn to belong to the German. In *i* bases the Guna *i* is melted down with that of the base to long *i* (written *ei*, §. 70.); hence, *gastei-s*, *anstei-s*, from *GASTI*, *ANSTI* (cf. p. 105.). The Zend employs Guna or not at pleasure; hence 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬋 *paity-ô*, or *paitay-ô*,† 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬬𐬋 *paśv-ô*, or *paśav-ô*.

231. Neuters have, in Zend, as in the cognate European languages, a short *a* for their termi- [G. Ed. p. 265.] nation‡; perhaps the remains of the full *as*, which belongs to the natural genders, after the *s*, which is too per-

---

* This form is, in my opinion, to be so regarded, as that, for greater emphasis, the termination *as* has been a second time appended to the termination, which had become concrete with the base.

† The *i*, which, according to §. 41., is blended with the base, remains in spite of the *a* preceding the *y*.

‡ Simple as this point is, I have nevertheless found it very difficult to come to a firm conclusion regarding it, although, from the first, I have directed my attention towards it. Burnouf has already (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III. 309, 310) given the plural neuter form, and instituted comparisons with the Gothic and Greek, &c. But from forms like *hu-mata*, "*bene-cogitata*," "*hûcta*," "*bene-dicta*," it cannot be perceived what the neuter plural termination properly is; because, setting out with the Sanskrit, we are tempted to assume that the true termination in these forms has

sonal for the dead speechless gender, has been dropped. [G. Ed. p. 266.] This *a* remains, then, in the accusative. The masculine and feminine have, in the same case, generally likewise *as* (Zend 𐬋 *ô*, 𐬀𐬯𐬗𐬀 *aścha*). The following are examples: 𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬥𐬀 *ashavan-a*, "*pura*;" 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬀 *bĕrĕzant-a*, "*splendentia*;" 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬀 *vâch-a*, "*verba*;" 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬀 *nar-a*, "*homines*;" 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀 *ast-a*, "*ossa*." In nominal bases in *a* the termination is melted down with the vowel of the base: the *â* so produced has, however, in the received condition of the language, according to a

---

has been dropped, and its loss either compensated by lengthening the final vowel, or not. We must therefore direct our attention to bases with a different termination than *a*, especially to such as terminate with a consonant. The examination of this subject is, however, much embarrassed, in that the Zend, without regard to the gender of the singular, is prone, contrary to natural expectation, to make every noun neuter in the plural; an inclination which goes so far, that the numerous class of *a* bases have hereby entirely lost the masculine nominative, and but sparingly exhibit the masculine accusative. When, *e.g. mashya*, "human being," is, in the plural nominative, likewise, *mashya* (with *cha*, *mashyâ-cha*), here I am nevertheless convinced that this plural *mashya*, or *mashyâ*, is not an abbreviation of *mashyân* from *mashyâs* (§. 56^{b}.), as in no other part of Zend Grammar 𐬀 *a* or 𐬁 *â* stands for आस् *âs*: I am persuaded that this form belongs to the neuter. The replacing, however, of the plural masculine by neuters rests upon a deep internal feeling of the language; for in the plural number it is clear that gender and personality are far in the back ground. The personality of the individual is lost in the abstract infinite and inanimate plurality; and so far we can but praise the Zend for its evitation of gender in the plural. We must blame it, however, in this point, that it does not, in all places, bring the adjectives or pronouns into concord with the substantives to which they refer, and that in this respect it exhibits a downright confusion of gender, and a disorder which has very much impeded the inquiry into this subject. Thus, *e.g. vîśpa anaghra-raochâo* (not *raoch-â*), "all lights which have had no beginning"; *tisarô* (fem.) *śata* or *thrayô* (masc.) *śata*, "three hundred"; *chathwârô* (masc.) *śata* "four hundred." In general the numbers "three" and "four" appear to have lost the neuter; hence, also, *thrayô csafn-a*, "three nights," *chathwârô csafn-a*, "four nights": in Vend. S. p. 237, on the other hand, stands *tâ nara yâ*, "those persons who . . . ." I divide thus *nar-a* although principle often quoted, been again shortened, and remains only in monosyllabic bases and before annexed particles. The Gothic and Zend, in this respect, stand [G. Ed. p. 267.] very remarkably upon one and the same footing; for *thô*, "*hæc*," is used (for *thâ*, §. 69.), from *THAa*; *hvô*, "*quæ*," for *HVAa*; but *daura*, from *DAURA*, as, in Zend, 𐬙𐬁 *tâ*, "*hæc*," 𐬫𐬁 *yâ*, "*quæ*," opposed to 𐬀𐬖𐬀 *agha*, "*peccata*," from *agha*. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Gothic that the *a* of the base has been dropped before that of the termi-

---

although the form might also belong to a theme *nara*, which also occurs, but much less frequently than *nar*; whence also, elsewhere, the masculine *nar-ô taê-cha*, "and those persons." From the theme *vâch*, "word," "speech," we find frequently *vâch-a* (also, erroneously as it appears, *vach-a*); *e.g.* Vend. S. p. 34, 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬀 𐬵𐬎𐬨𐬀𐬙𐬀 𐬵𐬏𐬑𐬙𐬀 𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬱𐬙𐬀 *vâcha humata hûcta hvarĕsta*, "*verba bene-cogitata, bene-dicta, bene-peracta.*" From 𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬥 *ashavan*, "pure," occurs very often the neuter plural *ashvana-a:* as, however, the theme *ashavan* sometimes, too, although very rarely, extends itself unorganically to *ashavana*, this form proves less (though it be incorrect) that the neuter *ashavan-a* should be derived from the unorganic extremely rare *ashavana*, than from the genuine and most common *ashavan*, in the weak cases *ashaun* or *ashaon*. Participial forms, too, in *nt* are very common in the neuter plural; and I have never found any ground for assuming that the Zend, like the Pâli and Old High German, has extended the old participial theme by a vowel addition. In the Vend. S., p. 119, we find an accusative *agha aiwishitâr-a*, "*peccata corrumpentia* (?)." Anquetil renders both expressions together by "*la corruption du cœur*" (II. 227.); but probably *aiwi-sitâra* stands for *-csitâra*, and means literally "the destroying" (cf. क्षि *kshi*, intrans. "to be ruined"). So much is certain, that *aiwi* is a preposition (p. 42), and *tar* is the suffix used in the formation of the word (§. 144.), which is in the strong cases *târ; and from this example it follows, as also from ashavan-a*, that where there are more forms of the theme than one, the Zend, like the Sanskrit (see Gramm. Crit. r. 185. c.), forms the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural from the stronger theme. I refrain from adducing other examples for the remarkable and not to have been expected proposition, that the Zend, in variance from the Sanskrit, forms its plural neuters according to the principle of the Latin *nomin-a*, Greek *τάλαν-α*, Gothic *namôn-a* or *namn-a*.

nation, for it could not be dropped, because the base-vowel and termination have been, from the first, concrete. The old length of quantity might, however, be weakened: this is the fate of long vowels especially at the end of words. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Greek τὰ δῶρα and the Latin *dona*, that the *a* entirely belongs to the termination, This *a* is an old inheritance of the oldest date, from the time when the second declension, to use the expression, terminated its bases with *ă*. This *ă* has since then become, in Greek, *ο* or *ε* (§. 204.), in Latin, *u*, *o*, or *e*, and has maintained its ancient quality only in the plural neuter, and the *ā*, which has grown out of *ă*+*ă*, has become shortened. This *ă*, however, in contrast with its offspring *ŏ*, *ĕ*, *ŭ*, may even pass for a more weighty ending, which unites base and termination, than if δωρο or δωρε, *donŏ*, *donĕ*, stood as the plural neuter.

232. Bases in *i* and *u* may, in Zend, suppress their final vowel before the termination, and *u* may be suppressed and replaced by lengthening the base-vowel: thus we read in the Vend. S. pp. 46 and 48, 𐬔𐬀𐬭𐬀 *gara*, "hills," from 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬌 *gairi* (see p. 196, Note †): on the other hand, p. 313, *gairîs* (fem.). That which Anquetil (II. 268.) renders by "*une action qui empêche de passer le pont, le péché contre nature,*" runs in the original (p. 119), 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 𐬀𐬥𐬁𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬀 𐬯𐬐𐬫𐬀𐬊𐬚𐬥𐬀 𐬫𐬁 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬋𐬬𐬀𐬌𐬞𐬀𐬫𐬀 *ayha anâpĕrĕtha skyaothna yâ narô-vaipaya*, [G. Ed. p. 268.] *i. e.* "the sins which stop the bridge, the actions which . . . ."; and here it is evident that *anâpĕrĕtha* stands for *anâpĕrĕthw-a*, for *pĕrĕtu* means actually "bridge."*

---

* Burnouf's MS. divides thus, *anâ pĕrĕtha*, which is following Olshausen (p. 6), but with the various reading *anâpĕrĕtha*. I have no ground for assuming that in Zend there exists a preposition *anâ*, "without," so that *anâ pĕrĕtha* might mean "without a bridge"; and that *pĕrĕtu* would, in the singular instrumental, form *pĕrĕthwa* or *pĕrĕtava*. I suppose, therefore, that *pĕrĕtu* may be conjoined with the preposition *â*, and then the negative *an* have been prefixed.

But a final *u* may also be retained, in the form of a semivowel, either pure or with Guna: the latter form I recognise in 𐬫𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬬𐬀 *yâtava* (Vend. S. p. 120; in Olshausen, p. 7), which can only be the plural accusative of 𐬫𐬁𐬙𐬎 *yâtu*, for it stands with 𐬀𐬖𐬀 *agha*, "*peccata*; and in the same page in Olshausen occurs a derivative of *yâtu* in the accusative singular, viz. 𐬫𐬁𐬙𐬎𐬨𐬉𐬧𐬙𐬉𐬨 *yâtumĕntĕm*, "the magician," "gifted with magic" (according to Anquetil, *magicien*). I render, therefore, *agha yâtava* literally by "the sins of sorcery" (Anquetil, "*la magie très mauvaise*"); and in Anquetil's Vocabulary is (p. 467) 𐬫𐬁𐬚𐬬𐬀𐬧𐬨 *yâthvaňm*, the regular plural genitive of our base *yâtu*, which means, therefore, "of the sorceries"; while Anquetil faultily gives it the meaning of the derivative (*magiciens*), and, according to his custom, takes this oblique case for a nominative. An example of a neuter plural form without Guna is at V. S. p. 122, 𐬵𐬉𐬧𐬛𐬬𐬀 *hĕndva* "the Indies"; with *hapta hĕndu*, "the seven Indies" (Anq. II. p. 270). It has the epithet *us-astar-a* ("up-starred?") in opposition to 𐬛𐬀𐬎𐬱𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬉𐬨 𐬵𐬉𐬧𐬛𐬎𐬨 *daus-astarĕm hĕndum*, "to the ill-starred (?) [G. Ed. p. 269.] Indies." An example, in which the suppressed termination in a *u* base is replaced by lengthening the final vowel, is the very frequently occurring 𐬬𐬋𐬵𐬏 *vôhû*, "goods," from 𐬬𐬋𐬵𐬎 *vôhu*.

233. The interrogative base *ki* (cf. *quis, quid*), which in Sanskrit forms only the singular nominative-accusative (neuter) किम् *ki-m*, but is elsewhere replaced by *ka*; whence, in Zend, 𐬐𐬀𐬝 *ka-ṭ*, "what": this base, the use of which is very limited, forms in Zend the plural neuter 𐬐𐬫𐬀 *ky-a**; and

---

* V. S. p. 341. 𐬐𐬫𐬀 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬉 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀 𐬫𐬋𐬌 𐬵𐬉𐬧𐬙𐬌 𐬔𐬁𐬚𐬂𐬵𐬬𐬀 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬱 𐬁𐬨𐬭𐬏𐬙𐬀 *kya aêtê vacha yôi hĕnti gâthâhva thris âmrûta* (erroneously *thris âmrûta*), "What are the words which are thrice said in the prayers (songs)?" The masculine forms *aêtê* and *yôi* can here, according to Note at §. 231., occasion no difficulty. So also V. S. p. 85, 𐬐𐬫𐬀 *kya* before

this form is the more important, since we still require examples which can be relied upon, in which the *i* of the base is not suppressed before the termination *a* (above, *gara* for *gairy-a*), although it may with reason be conjectured, that, in accordance with the abovementioned *hĕndv-a* and *yâtav-a*, forms also like *vairy-a* or *vairay-a*, from *vairi*, were in use. As in Gothic, neuter substantive and adjective bases in *i* are wanting, the numeral base *THRI*, "three," and the pronominal base *I*, "he," are very important for the neuter cases under discussion, in which they form *thriy-a* (*thriya hunda*, "three hundred") and *iy-a*, according to the principle of the Sanskrit monosyllabic forms, of which the *i* sound has not passed into its simple semi-vowel, but into *iy*; thus, in Sanskrit, भिया *bhiy-â*, from भी *bhî*.

234. The Sanskrit gives, in place of the Zend-European neuter *a*, an इ *i*, perhaps as the weakening of a former *a* [G. Ed. p. 270.] (§. 6.); the final vowel of the base is lengthened, and between it and the case termination a euphonic *n* is placed (§. 133.); hence दानानि *dânâ-n-i*, वारीणि *vârî-ṇ-i*,* मधूनि *madhû-n-i*.† The bases which terminate with a single consonant—न् *n* and र् *r* being excepted—prefix to it a nasal,

---

before the masculine 𐬭𐬀𐬙𐬀𐬬𐬋 *ratavô* (𐬭𐬀𐬙𐬀𐬬𐬋 𐬐𐬌𐬌𐬀 *kya ratavô*, "which are the lords"?).

* According to a euphonic law (Gram. Crit. r. 84^a.), an न् *n* following after र् *r*, and some other letters, is, under certain conditions, changed into ण् *ṇ*.

† In the Vêdas, the *ni* in *a* bases is frequently found suppressed; *e.g.* विश्वा *viśwâ*, "*omnia*," from *viśwa*. In this way the Sanskrit is connected with the Zend *vîspa*, *vîspâ-cha*: but perhaps this coincidence is only external; for as the Sanskrit nowhere uses a neuter termination *a*, विश्वा *viśwâ* cannot well be deduced from *vîspa+a*, but can only be explained as an abbreviation of the *â-ni*, which likewise occurs in the Vêdas, as also पुरू *purû*, "*multa*," "*magna*," is used for पुरूणि *purûṇi* (Rosen's Spec. pp. 9, 10).

and after *ś* and *n* the preceding vowel is lengthened; hence वचांसि *vachân-si*, नामानि *nâmân-i*. Into relation with this *i* might be brought the neuter inflexion of *quæ* (*quai*) and *hæ-c* (*haic*) which stand in Latin very isolated; *quæ* is, however, still tolerably distant from the Sanskrit कानि *kâ-n-i*, while it is nearly identical with the neuter dual के *kê* from *ka+i* (§. 212.). Since, however, the antiquity of this dual termination is supported by the Zend, the plural form *kâni* stands on the other side isolated, and its age is thereby rendered doubtful; as, moreover, the Latin, in the verb also, has introduced a termination originally dual into the plural[*]; [G. Ed. p. 271.] we cannot avoid recognising in the Latin plural *quæ* a remnant as true as possible of the Sanskrit dual के *kê*.

235. We give here a general view of the formation of the plural nominative, and of the vocative, identical with it and the neuter accusative:

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vṛikâs,*	*vĕhrkâoṇhô,*[†]	λύκοι,	*lup'-ī,*	*wilkai,*	*vulfôs.*
m.	*tê,*	*tê,*	τοί,	*is-t'ī,*	*tie,*[‡]	*thai.*
n.	*dânâ-n-i,*	*dâta,*	δῶρα,	*dona,*	. . . .	*daura.*
f.	*jihwâs,*	*hizvâo,*	χῶραι,	*terrae,*	*rankos,*	*gibôs.*

---

[*] The termination *tis* answers to थस् *thas*, Greek τον from τος, not to थ *tha* or त *ta*, Greek τε. With respect to the otherwise remarkable declension of *qui*, and of *hic*, which is akin to it, I would refer preliminarily to my treatise "On the Influence of Pronouns in the formation of Words" (by F. Dümmler), p. 2.

[†] See §. 229.

[‡] This form belongs not to the base *TA* (=त *ta*), whence, in the singular, *ta-s*, and nearly all the other cases; but to *TIA*, whence, through the influence of the *i*, *tie* has been developed (cf. p. 174, Note* and §. 193.); and whence, in the dative dual and plural, *tie-m*, *tie-ms*. The nominative plural is, however, without a case termination. The original form *TIA* corresponds to the Vêda त्य *tya*, mentioned in §. 194.; while the base स्य *sya* (ष्य *shya*, see §. 55.) is fully declined in Lithuanian in the form of *SZIE*, and in the plural nominative, likewise without inflexion, is

[G. Ed. p. 272.]

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
f.	*tâs,*	*tâo,*	ταί,	*is-tae,*	*tes,*	*thôs.*
m.	*patay-as,*	*paity-ô,**	πόσι-ες,	*host'-ēs,*†	....	*gastei-s.*
f.	*prîtay-as,*	*âfrîty-ô,**	πόρτι-ες,	*mess'-ēs,*†	*áwy-s,*	*anstei-s.*
n.	*vârî-n-i,*	*var'-a,*	ἴδρι-α,	*mari-a,*	....	....
n.	....	*ky-a,*‡	....	....	....	*iy-a.*
f.	*bhavishyanty-as,*	*bûshyainty-ô,**	....	....	....	....
m.	*sûnav-as,*	*paśv-ô,**	ἰχθύ-ες,	*pecū-s,*	*sùnu-s,*	*sunyu-s.*
f.	*tanav-as,*	*tanv-ô,**	πίτυ-ες,	*socrū-s,*	....	*handyu-*
n.	*madhû-n-i,*	*madhv-a,*	μέθυ-α,	*pecu-a,*	....	....
f.	*vadhw-as,*	....	....	....	....	....
m.f.	*gâv-as,*	*geu-s,*§	βό(F)-ες,	*bov-ēs,*†	....	....

---

is *szie.* From the pronominal declension the form *ie* (from *ia*) has found its way into the declension of the adjective also: so that the base *GERA*, "good," forms several cases from *GERIE*; viz. dat. du. *gerie-m* for *gera-m,* dat. pl. *gerie-ms* for *gera-ms,* and nom. pl. *gerì* for *gerai.* This *gerì* appears to stand in most complete agreement with the Latin nominatives of the corresponding declension (*bonī, lupī*); but the difference between the two languages is this, that the *i* of *boni* (for *bono-i*) belongs to the termination, while *gerì* is void of termination, and stands for *gerie* (analogous with *tie*), but this latter for *gerie-i* (cf. *yaunikkie-i.*)

* See p. 163, Note ‡.

† See p. 1078.

‡ To this *ky-a,* from *ki-a,* cerresponds surprisingly the Latin *qui-a* (*quianam, quiane*), if, as I scarce doubt, it is a plural neuter, as *quod* is a singular neuter (cf. Max. Schmidt "*De pron. Græco et Latino,*" p. 34). In the meaning "that," *quia* is clearly shewn to be an accusative: the meaning "because" is less apt for this case, and would be better expressed by an instrumental or an ablative; but in the singular *quod* we must be content to see the idea "because" expressed by an accusative. On the other hand, *quo,* among other meanings, signifies "whither," a genuine accusative signification in Sanskrit grammar. Without the support of *quod* we might conjecture that an instrumental singular had been preserved in *quia,* after the analogy of 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬀 *paity-a,* for *paiti.*

§ We might expect *gav-ô, gavaś-cha,* "*bovesque;*" but we read 𐬔𐬈𐬎𐬱 *geus* in the Vend. S. p. 253, L. 9, in combination with the pronominal neuters 𐬙𐬁 *tâ,* "*illa,*" 𐬫𐬁 *yâ,* "*quæ,*" which, according to §. 231. Note, cannot surprise us.

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
nâv-as,	....	*νᾶ(Ϝ)-ες,*	....	....	....
vâch-as,	*vâch-ô,**	*ὄπ-ες,*	*vocēs,*†	....	....
bharant-as,	*barĕnt-ô,**	*φέροντ-ες,*	*ferent-ēs,*†	....	*fiyand-s.*
âtmân-as,	*as̊man-ô,*	*δαίμον-ες,*	*sermon-ēs,*†	....	*aḣman-s.*
nâmân-i,	*nâman-a,*	*τάλαν-α,*	*nomin-a,*	....	*namôn-a.*
bhrâtar-as,	*brâtar-ô,**	*πατέρ-ες,*	*fratr-es,*†	....	....‡
duhitar-as,	*dughdhar-ô,**	*θυγατέρ-ες,*	*matr-es,*†	*dugter-ės,*	....
dâtâr-as,	*dâtâr-ô,**	*δοτῆρ-ες,*	*datōr-es,*†	....	....
vachâṅs-i,	*vachaṇh-a,*§	*ἔπε(σ)-α,*	*oper-a,*	....	....

[G. Ed. p. 273.]

THE ACCUSATIVE.

236. The bases which end with a short vowel annex न् *n* in Sanskrit, and lengthen the final vowel of the base; hence, वृकान् *vrikân,* पतीन् *patîn,* सूनून् *sûnûn,* &c. We might imagine this *n* to be related to the *m* of the singular accusative, as in the verb the termination आनि *âni* (1st pers. sing. imperative) has clearly proceeded from आमि *âmi.* The cognate dialects speak, however, in favour of Grimm's acute conjecture, that the Sanskrit *n* is, in the accusative plural masculine, an abbreviation of *ns,*|| which has remained entire in the Gothic—*vulfa-ns, gasti-ns, sunu-ns,*—but has been divided in the other sister languages; since the Sanskrit, according to §. 94., has given up the latter of the two con-

---

* See p. 163. Note ‡

† See Note † in preceding page.

‡ The Gothic *r* bases annex in the plural a *u*, and can therefore be contrasted no further with the cognate languages. *BRÔTHAR* becomes *BRÔTHRU,* whence *brôthryu-s,* &c., according to the analogy of *sunyu-s.*

§ Or 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬆𐬢𐬵𐬀 *vacheṇha.* Thus we read Vend. S. p. 127, *nĕmĕṇha,* which, I think, must be regarded as accusative of *nĕmô* (नमस् *namas,* "adoration"), and as governed by 𐬠𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀 *bĕrĕthra,* "from him who brings," "from him offering."

|| The Old Prussian, too, exhibits in the acc. pl. *ns, e.g. tâva-ns, πατέρας.* Respecting the Vêda termination *ṅr,* from *ṅs,* see §. 517. Remark.

sonants, and has lengthened, as it appears, in compensation for this, the final vowel of the base*; while the Greek [G. Ed. p. 274.] *λύκους* has preserved the sibilant, but has permitted the *ν* to volatilize to *υ*.† In fact, *λυκο-υς* has the same relation to *λυκονς* that *τύπτουσι* has to *τύπτονσι*, from [G. Ed. p. 275.] *τύπτοντι*.‡ For *πόσι-ας*, *ἰχθύ-ας*, we could not, however, expect a *πόσι-νς*, *ἰχθύ-νς*, as the Greek makes the *ι* and *υ* bases in all parts similar to the bases which terminate with a consonant, which, in Sanskṛit, have *as* for a termination; hence पदस् *padas* = *πόδας*: and even in the most vigorous period of the language *ns* could not have attached itself to a consonant preceding. This *as* for *ns* may be compared with the Ionic *αται, ατο*, for *νται, ντο*, a form which has extended from the places where the vocalization of the *ν* was necessary, to those also where *ν* might be added (*πεπείθαται, τετράφαται*; then, also, *πεπαύαται, κεκλιάται*, &c. for *πέπαυνται, κέκλινται*). This comparison with the 3d person plural appears to me the more in point, as, in my opinion, the *n* in the presupposed forms, like वृकंस् *vṛikans*, पतिंस् *patins*, *λύκονς*, has the same object that it has in the 3d person plural; viz. allusion to plurality by extending (nasalizing) the syllable preceding the sign of personality. The introduction of a nasal is an admixture which is least of all foreign, and comes nearest to the mere lengthening of an already existing vowel.

---

* Thus *vṛikâṅ* for *vṛikaṅs*; as, विद्वांस् *vidwâṅs*, whence the accusative विद्वांसम् *vidwâṅs-am*, in the uninflected nominative विद्वान् *vidwâṅ*, ("*sapiens*").

† As the *ν* also passes into *ι* (*τιθείς* for *τιθένς*, Æolic *τύψαις*, *μέλαις* for *τυψαν(τ)ς*, *μελανς*), Hartung (l. c p. 263) is correct in explaining in this sense the *ι* in Æolic accusative forms like *νόμοις*, *τοὶς στρατηγοίς*, &c. As regards, however, the feminine accusatives like *μεγάλαις*, *ποικίλαις*, *τείμαις*, quoted by him, I believe that they have followed the analogy of the masculines, from which they sufficiently distinguish their gender by the *a* preceding the *ι*; we cannot, however, thence infer, that also the first and specially feminine declension had originally accusatives in *νς*, as neither has the Gothic in the corresponding declension an *ns*, nor does the Sanskṛit exhibit an *n* (see §. 287., and cf. Rask in Vater's Tables of Comparison, p. 62).

‡ It cannot be said that *τύπτουσι* proceeded from *τύπτοντσι*, a truly monstrous form, which never existed in Greek, while the *τύπτοντι* before us answers to all the requirements of Greek Grammar, as to that of the whole base, since *ο-ντι* corresponds to the Sansk. *anti*, Zend *ĕnti*, Goth. *nt'*; and from the singular *τι* (Dor.), in the plural nothing else than *ντι* can be expected. But to arrive at *ουσι* from *οντι* it is not requisite to invent first so strange a form as *οντσι*; for that *οντι* can become *ουσι* is proved by the circumstance that the latter has actually arisen from it, by the very usual transition of Τ into Σ, and the not rare vocalization of the Ν to Υ, as also in Sanskṛit, in all probability, उस् *us* has arisen from *nt* (cf. p. 172, Note *), of which more hereafter. But if in the dative plural, indeed, *ου-σι* has arisen from *οντ-σι*, not from *ον-σι* (*λέουσι* not *δαίμουσι*), we

237. Feminine bases with a final vowel follow in Sanskṛit the analogy of consonantal bases; but with the suppression of the *a*,* thus *s* for *as* or *ns*; they may perhaps, too, never have had *ns*, for else hence would have arisen, as in the masculine, a simple *n*: to the [G. Ed. p. 276.]

---

we must remember that the abandonment of the *n* before case terminations beginning with a consonant is a very old and therefore pre-Greek phenomenon, which is not to be accounted for in the Greek, and wherefore no compensation is to be required for the *ν*, which has been dropped. But even if it were so, we must still be satisfied, if the demand for compensation for a lost *ν* remains unfulfilled in several places of grammar; for there are two kinds of euphonic alteration in all languages: the one, which has acquired the force of a general law, makes its appearance under a similar form on each similar occasion, while the other only irregularly and occasionally shews itself.

* Monosyllabic bases only have preserved the *a* as the case sign in the singular nominative (§. 137.); hence, स्त्रियस् *striy-as*, "*feminas*," भुवस् *bhuvas*, "*terras*," from स्त्री *strî*, भू *bhû*. There is scarce a doubt that this form originally extended to polysyllabic bases also; for besides the Greek, the Zend also partly evinces this (§. 238.), as also the circumstance that in the actual condition of the Sanskṛit language the accusative plural shews, in general, an inclination to weaken itself, and thus contrast itself more submissively with the imperious nominative (§. 129.).

feminine gender, too, the well-sounding Ionic *a* is more suitable than *n*. In general, the Sanskṛit feminines in other parts of grammar cast off the *n*, which is annexed by masculines and neuters (§. 133.). Moreover, the Gothic also, in feminine *ô* bases, gives no *ns*, but it appears that *thôs* = तास् *tâs* (*eas, has*) is a pure dowry from the ancestral house; and when the feminine *i* and *u* bases in Gothic, by forms like *i-ns, u-ns*, assimilate themselves to the masculines, this may be regarded as a disguise of gender, or a deviation caused by the example of the masculines. The consonant bases follow the example of the Indian, but have lost the *a*, as in the nominative (§. 227.); hence, *fiyand-s, ahman-s*, for *fiyand-as, ahman-as*.

238. Feminines with a short final vowel lengthen it, to compensate, as it appears, for the suppression of the *a*; thus प्रीतिस् *prîti-s* is formed from *prîty-as*, and तनूस् *tanû-s* from *tanw-as*. The Greek certainly presents, in this respect, only a casual coincidence, through forms in ῖς, ῦς, which, however, are not restricted to the feminine, and stand at the same time, in the nominative, for ι-ες, υ-ες. The Zend, like the Greek, follows in its *i* and *u* bases the analogy of the consonantal terminations; hence, 𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬋 *paity-ô* (*paity-aś-cha,*) 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎𐬎𐬋 *paśv-ô* (*paśv-aś-cha*, or, with Guna, *paitay-ô*, *paśav-ô*. In feminine bases in *i, u*, occur at times also the forms *î-s, û-s*, corresponding to the Sanskṛit; as, 𐬔𐬀𐬌𐬭𐬍𐬯 *gairî-s*, "*montes*" (Vendidâd S. p. 313.), 𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬰𐬏𐬯 *ĕrĕzû-s*, "*rectas*," 𐬙𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬏𐬯 *tafnû-s*, "*urentes*," 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬏𐬯 *pĕrĕtû-s*, "*pontes*."

239. Masculine bases in 𐬀 *a*, where they are not replaced by the neuter (§. 231. Note), have, in the accusative, *aṅ* (cf. §. 61.); as, 𐬌𐬨𐬄𐬥 *imaṅ*,* "*hos*," often occurs, 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬄𐬥 *mazistaṅ*, "*maximos*" (Vend. S. p. 65.). The sibilant is retained before the [G. Ed. p. 277.] particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, and these forms can be copiously quoted; as, 𐬀𐬨𐬆𐬱𐬄𐬯𐬗𐬀 *amĕshaṅś-cha*, "*non-*

---

* Cf. Vêdic forms in *ẩṅ*.

conniventesque"; 𐬨𐬄𐬚𐬭𐬄𐬱𐬗𐬀 *maṅthraṅś-cha*, "*sermonesque*"; 𐬀𐬉𐬯𐬨𐬄𐬱𐬗𐬀 *aêśmaṅś-cha*, "*lignaque*"; 𐬬𐬁𐬯𐬙𐬭𐬫𐬄𐬱𐬗𐬀 *vâstryaṅś-cha*, "*agricolasque.*"* The form 𐬀𐬚𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬄𐬱𐬗𐬀 *athaurun-aṅś-cha*, "*presbyterosque*" (V. S. p. 65.), is remarkable, as there is no reason elsewhere to assume a theme *athauruna;* and this form would accordingly shew that consonantal bases also could assume the inflexion *ns*, with an unavoidable auxiliary vowel however; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that, in the perverted feeling of the language, it has been introduced by the preponderating analogy of the *a* bases. More important, therefore, than this 𐬀𐬚𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬎𐬥𐬄𐬱𐬗𐬀 *athaurunaṅs-cha* are the accusatives 𐬥𐬀𐬭𐬈𐬎𐬯 *nareus*, "*homines,*" and 𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬈𐬎𐬯 *śtreus*, "*stellas,*" which occur very frequently; while from 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭 *âtar*, "fire," we have found, not 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬈𐬎𐬯 *âthr-eus*, but 𐬁𐬚𐬭𐬋 *âthr-ô*, in which it is to be remarked that *âtar* distinguishes itself from other words in *r* in this point also, that it forms, in the nominative singular, not 𐬁𐬙𐬀 *âta*, but 𐬁𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬯 *âtars*. But how is the termination *eus* to be explained? I believe in no other way but from 𐬄𐬱 *aṅś*, by changing the *n* into a vowel, as in [G. Ed. p. 278.] λόγους; after which, according to §. 31., the 𐬀 *a* has become 𐬈 *e*: the sibilant, however, which, after 𐬀 *a* and 𐬄 *aṅ*, is 𐬱 *ś*, must, after 𐬎 *u*, appear as 𐬯 *s*. We actually find, too, in the V. S. p. 311, 𐬥𐬆𐬭𐬄𐬱 *nĕr-aṅś* in the sense of a dative:

---

* I formerly thought I could, through forms of this kind, quote the introduction of a euphonic *s* in Zend, according to the analogy of §. 96. But if this introduction cannot be proved by cases, in which no ground exists for the assumption of an original sibilant, preserved merely by the particle 𐬗𐬀 *cha* (cf. §§. 56^{b}. 207. 228.), then the above examples are the more important, in order to supply a fresh proof that *ṅs* is the original designation of masculine plural accusatives of themes terminating with a vowel. The superlative 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬄𐬱𐬙𐬆𐬨𐬀 *vĕrĕthrazaṅśtĕma* (of which hereafter) may be regarded as derived from a participial nominative. Other cases, which might suggest occasion to assume, in Zend, a euphonic *s* after *n*, have been nowhere met with by me.

𐬛𐬁𐬌𐬛𐬌 𐬀𐬝 𐬥𐬆𐬭𐬀𐬢𐬱 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬛𐬁 𐬀𐬵𐬎𐬭𐬁 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬊𐬥𐬋 *dâidi aṭ nĕrañś mazdâ ahurâ ashaonô*, &c. "*da quidem hominibus, magne Ahure! puris.*"

240. As *a* in Sanskṛit occurs the most often of all letters as the termination of masculine bases, and we cannot mistake, in the history of our family of languages, the disposition in the sunken state of a language to introduce, by an unorganic addition, the more inconvenient consonantal declension into that of the vowels, I cannot therefore think that it admits of any doubt, that the New Persian plural termination *ân*, which is restricted to the designation of animate creatures, is identical with the Sanskṛit आन् *ân* in the masculine plural accusative: thus, مردان *mardân*, "*homines*," answers to मर्त्यान् *martyân*, "*mortales*," "*homines*."*

241. If, then, the termination ان *ân*, applied to animate beings, belongs to a living being in the old language, the inanimate neuter will be fitted to give us information regarding that New Persian plural termination which is appended to the appellations of inanimate objects. A suffix, in the formation of words which is peculiarly the property of the neuter, is अस् *as* (§. 128.), which is still more frequently used in Zend than in Sanskṛit. In the plural, these Zend neuters form *aṅha* or *ĕnha* (§§. 56ª. 235.); and with this *ha* is evidently connected the lengthened ها *hâ* in New Persian; thus, روزها *roz-hâ*, "days," answers to the Zend 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀 *raochaṅha*, "lights." Many New Persian words have been compared with New German words, [G. Ed. p. 279.] and often, too, correctly; but, except through the medium of the Sanskṛit and Zend, it could not have been conjectured that our "*Wörter*" is, in respect to its termination, related to the New Persian *hâ*. As, however, the High German has, from its earliest period, repeatedly changed *s* into *r*, and *a* into *i* (later *e*), I have no

---

* Thus in Spanish the whole plural has the termination of the Latin accusative.

doubt the *ir*—Middle and New High German *er*—which makes its appearance in the plural in many Old High German neuters, is identical with the Sanskrit neuter suffix अस् *as; e.g. hûsir,* "houses," *chalpir,* "calves" (cf. Grimm, pp. 622 and 631).*

242. Here follows a general view of the accusative formation:

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC
m.	*vṛikâ-n,*	*vĕhrka-ṅ,*	λύκο-υς,	*lupō-s,*	*wilkù-s,*	*vulfa-ns*
n.	*dânâ-n-i,*	*dâta,*	δῶρα,	*dona,*	. . . .	*daura.*
f.	*jihwâ-s,*	*hizvâ-o,*	χώρā-ς,	*terrā-s,*	*rankà-s,*	*gibô-s,*
f.	*tâ-s,*	*tâ-o,*	τā-ς,	*is-tā-s,*	*tà-s,*	*thô-s.*
m.	*patî-n,*	*paity-ô,*†	πόσι-ας,	*host'-es,*	. . . .	*gasti-ns.*
f.	*bhiy-as,*	*âfrîty-ô,*†	πόρτι-ας,	*mess'-es,*	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*prîtî-s,*	*âfrîtî-s,*	πόρτῑ-ς,	. . . .	*áwy-s,*	*ansti-ns*
n.	*vârî-ṇ-i,*	*var'-a,*	ἴδρι-α,	*mari-a,*	. . . .	. . . .
n.	. . . .	*kya,*	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .	*iy-a.*
f.	*bhavishyantî-s,*	*bûshyaintî-s,*†	. . . .	. . . .	[G. Ed. p. 280.]	
m.	*sûnû-n,*	*paśv-ô,*†	ἰχθύ-ας,	*pecū-s,*	*sunù-s,*	*sunu-ns*
f.	*bhuv-as,*	*tanv-ô,*†	πίτυ-ας,	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
f.	*tanû-s,*	*tanû-s,*	πίτῡ-ς,	*socrū-s,*	. . . .	*handu-*
m.	*madhû-n-i,*	*madhv-a.*‡	μέθυ-α,	*pecu-a,*	. . . .	. . . .

---

* This *ir*, however, is treated in declension as if the theme originally terminated in *a*, and would thus, in Sanskrit, be *asa*. Hence, compared with the dative *hûsiru-m* (from *hûsira-m*, §. 168.), the nom. accus. *hûsir* appears an abbreviation. But the relation of our *ir* to the Sanskrit *as* is not thereby disturbed, because in general, most of the original consonantal terminations in High German have received unorganic vowel additions. Cf. pp. 148 and 191, G. Ed. Note. More regarding this hereafter.

† See p. 175, G. Ed. Note. ‡.

‡ This form is further confirmed by [illegible] *pĕśô-tanva*, from *pĕśô-tanu*, which signifies the hind part of the body (§. 199.), but is also used in the sense of "blow on the hinder part of the body"; and in this manner it occurs in the 15th Fargard of the Vend.: [illegible] *ainhaṭ* (*ainhâṭ?*) *hacha*

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
f.	*vadhû-s,*	....	....	....	....	....
m. f.	*gâ-s,**	*gâu-s,*	*βό(F)-ας,*	*bov-ēs,*	....	....
f.	*nâv-as.*	....	*νᾶ(F)-ας,*	....	....	....
f.	*vâch-as,*	*vâch-ô,*†	*ὄπ-ας,*	*voc-ēs,*	....	....
m.	*bharat-as,*‡	*barĕnt-ô,*†	*φέροντ-ας,*	*ferent-ēs,*	....	*fiyand-s.*
m.	*âtman-as,*	*aśman-ô,*†	*δαίμον-ας,*	*sermon-ēs,*	....	*ahman-s.*
n.	*nâmân-i,*	*nâman-a,*	*τάλαν-α,*	*nomin-a,*	....	*namôn-a.*
m.	*bhrâtṛī-n,*§	*brâthr-eus?*	*πατέρ-ας,*	*fratr-es,*	....	....
f.	*duhitṛī-s,*§	*dughdhĕr-eus?*	*θυγατέρ-ας,*	*matr-es,*	*dugter-ės,*	....
m.	*dâtṛī-n,*§	*dâthr-eus?*	*δοτῆρ-ας,*	*datōr-ēs,*	....	....
n.	*vachâṅs-i,*	*vachaṇh-a,*	*ἔπε(σ)-α,*	*oper-a,*	....	....

THE INSTRUMENTAL.

[G. Ed. p. 281.] 243. The formation of this case, and what is connected with it, has been already explained in §§. 215—224.; it is therefore sufficient to give here a comparison of the forms which correspond to one another in the cognate languages,

---

hacha skyaôthnâ-varĕza atha bavainti pĕśô-tanva, "*hac pro facti-peractione tum sunt verbera posteriori corpori inflicta*" (Anquetil, *Celui qui commet cette action sera coupable du tanafour*). In regard to the *anâpĕretha*, mentioned at §. 232., it is further to be noticed that the 𐬚 *th* can only be occasioned by a 𐬬 *w* that has been dropped (§. 47.), for the theme of the concluding substantive is 𐬞𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙𐬎 *pĕrĕtu*, not *pĕrĕthu* (Vend. S. pp. 313 and 362, twice).

* Irregularly from a theme गा *gâ* (§. 122.), for गवस् *gav-as*. The Zend 𐬔𐬁𐬎𐬯 *gâus* (also 𐬔𐬁𐬊𐬯 *gâos*), which often occurs, rests on the strengthened Sanskṛit form गौ *gâu*; so that in respect of the strong and weak cases (§. 129.), the relation in this word is distorted. In the nominative, for instance, we should expect 𐬔𐬁𐬎𐬯 *gâus*, and in the accusative 𐬔𐬆𐬎𐬯 *geus*, rather than *vice versâ*.

† See p. 163, Note ‡.

‡ See §. 129.

§ See §. 127. Note and §. 249. Note ‡.

by which a summary view of the subject may be assisted. As the German, in its singular dative,* is identical with the Sanskṛit-Zend instrumental, it is hence deducible that its character *m* (for *b* see §. 215.), in the dative plural, must rather be regarded as an abbreviation of भिस् *bhis* than as belonging to the dative-ablative termination भ्यस् *bhyas;* although it approaches equally near to the two old terminations.

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTH. DAT.
m.	*vṛikê-bhis,*	....	*θεό-φιν,*	*vo-bīs,*	....	*vulfa-m.*
	vṛikâ-is,	*vĕhrkâ-is,*	....	....	*wilka-is,*	....
f.	*jihwâ-bhis,*	*hizvâ-bîs,*	....	....	*ranko-mis,*	*gibô-m.*
	prîti-bhis,	*âfrîti-bîs,*	....	....	*awi-mis,*	*ansti-m.*
m.	*sûnu-bhis,*	*paśu-bîs,*	....	....	*sunu-mis,*	*sunu-m.*
f.	*nau-bhis,*	....	*ναῦ-φιν,*	....	....	....
m.	*âtma'-bhis,*	*aśma'-bîs,*	....	....	....	*ahma'-m.*
n.	*nâma'-bhis,*	*nâma'-bîs,*	....	....	....	*namn-am.*
n.	*vachô-bhis,*†	*vachô-bîs,*†	*ὄχεσ-φιν,*†	....	[G. Ed. p. 282.]	

THE DATIVE, ABLATIVE.

244. Mention has already been made of the suffix of these two cases in §. 215. Only the *s* of the Latin *bus* has been left in the first, second, and (according to Nonius) occasionally, also, in the fourth declension; for the *i* of *lupī-s, terrī-s, specī-s* (for *speci-bus* from *specu-bus*), must be allotted to the base. *Lupi-s* stands for *lupo-bus,* as evinced by *ambo-bus, duo-bus.* From *o-bus* (by lightening the final vowel of the base, *o, u,* from an original *a,* §. 6.), as occurs in the beginning of compounds (*multi-plex* for *multu-plex* or *multo-plex,* of which hereafter), the language arrived at *i-bus,* (*parvi-bus, amici-bus, dii-bus,* cf. Hartung, p. 261). In the first declension *a-bus* has been retained with tolerable

---

* Vide §. 160. Note ‡

† See §§. 56^b. and 128.

frequency, but the middle step *i-bus* is wanting; yet the language has scarcely made the spring from *a-bus* at once to *ī-s*, but *a-bus* has weakened the *a* of the base to ĭ, which, to compensate for the *bu* which has been dropped, has been lengthened; thus *terrī-s* from *terri-bus*, for *terra-bus*, as [G. Ed. p. 283.] *mālo* from *măvolo*. Compare,

SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	LATIN.	LITHUANIAN.
m. *vrikê-bhyas,*	*vĕhrkaêi-byô,*	*lupī-s.*	*wilka-m(u)s.**
f. *jihwâ-bhyas,*	*hizvâ-byô,*	*terrī-s,*	*ranko-m(u)s.*
m. *pati-bhyas,*	*paiti-byô,*	*hosti-bus,*	....†
f. *prîti-bhyas,*	*âfrîti-byô,*	*messi-bus,*	*awi-m(u)s.*
m. *bhavishyantî-bhyas,*	*bûshyainti-byô,*	....	....
m. *sûnu-bhyas,*	*paśu-byô,*	*pecu-bus,*‡	*sunu-m(u)s,*
f. *vâg-bhyas,*	*vâch-e-byô,*	*voc-i-bus.*	....
m. *bharad-bhyas,*	*barĕn-byô,*§	*ferent-i-bus,*	....
m. *âtma'-bhyas,*	*aśma'-byô,*	*sermon-i-bus,*	....
m. *bhrâtṛi-bhyas,*	*brâtar-ĕ-byô,*	*fratr-i-bus,*	....

THE GENITIVE.

245. The genitive plural in Sanskṛit, in substantives and adjectives, has the termination आम् *âm*, in the Zend *aṅm*, according to §. 61. The Greek ων bears the same relation to the original form of the termination that ἐδίδων does to अददाम् *adadâm* (§§. 4. 10.). The Latin has, as usual,

---

* See §. 215.

† The masculine *i* bases pass in the plural, by an unorganic increment, into a different declension. And in the dual and dative singular, also, *PATI* had to be given up (Mielcke, p. 35, Rem. 1.).

‡ I have selected the masculine base *PECU*, which occurs only in a few cases, on account of its connection with 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎 *paśu*, and I have carried it through all the cases, and think, therefore, that I may here also give the original *u-bus* for the corruption *i-bus*.

§ See §. 224. Note *, p. 241.

preserved the labial final nasal in its original form, but by its influence has shortened the preceding vowel; hence, *ped-um* (=*pad-âm*), the *u* of which supplies the place of a short *a*, as in *lupum* = वृकम् *vrikam*, λύκο-ν.* [G. Ed. p. 284.] The German, like the Lithuanian, has dropped the final nasal. In Gothic, however, the आ *â*, which has been left, shews itself under two forms, and thereby an unorganic difference has been introduced between the feminine genitive termination and that of the masculine-neuter; since the fuller *ô* has remained only to the feminine *ô* and *n* bases.

246. Bases ending with a vowel, with the exception, partly necessary and partly arbitrary, of monosyllables, place, in Sanskrit, a euphonic *n* between the termination and the base, the final vowel of which, if short, is lengthened. This interposition appears to be pristine, since the Zend partakes of it, although in a more limited degree; for instance, in all bases in 𐬀 *a* and 𐬁 *â*: hence, 𐬬𐬆𐬵𐬭𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬄𐬨 *vĕhrka-n-aṅm*, 𐬘𐬌𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬄𐬨, *jihva-n-aṅm*. To the latter correspond very remarkably the genitives (which occur in Old High German, Old Saxon, and Anglo-Saxon, in the

---

* Regarding the termination *i-um* in consonantal bases, and, *vice versâ*, respecting *um* in places where *i-um* might have been expected, we refer the reader to §. 126. In adjectives the feminine character *î* mentioned in §. 119. may have had its effect, and may have passed over from the feminine to the other genders, according to the analogy of the Lithuanian (p. 174. Note * §. 157.): thus the *i* of *ferenti-um* reminds us of the Sanskrit feminine भरन्ती *bharantî*. The same is the case with the *i* of the neuter form *ferenti-a*; it is bequeathed by the deceased feminine theme *FERENTI*. On the other hand, contrary to the opinion preferred in §. 126., we must now regard the *i* before *bus* (*e.g. voc-i-bus*) as a conjunctive vowel, like the 𐬈 *e* in the Zend *vâch-e-byô*. Here it is to be observed that those consonantal bases, which admit neither *i-a* nor *i-um*, must nevertheless proceed before *bus* to annex an *i*. In the chapter upon the adjectives we shall recur to the feminine character *î*; and then treat also of the *i* for in the singular ablative of the common dialect.

corresponding class of words) in *ô-n-ô*, *e-n-a*; hence, Old High German *këpô-n-ô*, Old Saxon *gëbô-n-ô*, Anglo-Saxon *gife-n-a*.

247. We find the bases in short and long *i*, in Zend, if [G. Ed. p. 285.] polysyllabic, only with euphonic *n*: on the other hand the monosyllabic *i* bases annex the termination direct, either attaching Guna to the final vowel, or keeping it pure; thus, *thry-aṅm* or *thray-aṅm*, "*trium*," from *thri*; *vay-aṅm*, "*avium*," from *vi*. Bases in 𐬎 *u* admit both of the annexing the termination direct and of the insertion of the euphonic *n*; but I find from the masculine 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬎 *paśu* only *paśv-aṅm*: on the other hand, I have found from feminine bases like 𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬎 *tanu*, "body," 𐬥𐬀𐬯𐬎 *naśu*, "corpse" (cf. νέκυς according to §. 21.), hitherto only *u-n-aṅm*. With Guna 𐬞𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬄𐬨 *paśav-aṅm* would serve as a prototype for the Gothic *suniv-ê* with Guna weakened (§. 27.).

248. Pronouns of the third person have, in Sanskṛit, साम् *sâm** for आम् *âm*; and this may be the original and formerly universal form of the case-suffix, so that *âm* would properly be only the termination of the termination, and the *s* connected with the genitive singular would be the chief person. If this is the case, the abbreviation of this termination in substantives and adjectives must still be recognised as very ancient; for the Gothic, which in the plural nominative restricts itself so rigorously to the old limits (§. 228.), gives to the sibilant, in the genitive also, no wider scope; hence *thi-zê* (§. 86. 5.) = *te-shâm* (for *tê-sâm*, according to §. 21.) "*horum*"; *thi-zo* = *tâ-sâm*, "*harum*." Here the *a*, like the *ô* of the base *THA*, *THŌ*, appears weakened to *i* (§. 66.): on the other hand, the adjective *a* and *ô* bases, which follow the pronominal declension, have *ai-zê*, *ai-zô*; and *blindai-zê*, "*cæcorum*" (for *blinda-zê*), answers exactly to the Sanskṛit तेषाम् *te-shâm*

---

* Cf. Old Prussian *son*, *e.g.* in *stei-son*, "τῶν."

(from *taï·sâm*) from the base त *ta.* The High German has changed the old sibilant to *r*, as in many other places; hence, in Old High German, *dë-rô* for *thi-zê* and *thi-zô*, of which termination only the *r* has remained [G. Ed. p. 286.] to us. To the Latin, in like manner, belongs *rum* for *sum* (§. 22.); hence, *istorum*, *istarum*.*

249. We give here a general view of the formation of the genitive:

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
m.	*vṛikâ-n-âm,*	*věhrka-n-aṅm,*	*λύκ᾽-ων,*	*lupō-rum,*	*wilk'-û,*	*vulf'-ê.*
m. n.	*tê-ṣhâm,*	*taê-shaṅm,*	*τ᾽-ῶν,*	*istō-rum,*	*t'-û,*	*thi-zê.*
f.	*jihwâ-n-âm,*	*hizva-n-aṅm,*	*χωρά-ων,*	*terrā-rum,*	*rank'-û,*	*këpô-n-ô.*†

---

* This *rum*, however, has, like the property of the plural nominative (§. 228.), found its way or returned from the pronominal declension into the entire second, first, and fifth declension, which is originally identical with the latter (§§. 121 and 137.). The transplanting of the *rum* termination into the declensions mentioned was the easier, as all pronouns in the genitive plural belong to the second and first declension. Forms, however, remain, especially in the old languages, which evince that the language was not always equally favourable to the bringing back the termination *rum* (*deum*, *socium*, *amphorum*, *drachmum*, *agricolum*, &c). On the other hand, the termination *rum* appears also to have attempted to fix itself in consonantal bases, with *e* as conjunctive vowel, if, at least, the forms furnished by Varro and Charis.—*boverum*, *Joverum*, *lapiderum*, *regerum*, *nucerum* (Hartung, p. 255.)—are to be regarded as correct, and do not perhaps stand for *bovo-rum*, &c.; as also, in Zend, the base *gô* may extend itself to *gava*. The Latin *rum* and Sanskṛit साम् *sâm* lead us to expect the Greek *σων*: this is not met with, however, even in the pronoun; so that the Greek, in this respect, stands in the strongest opposition to the Latin. The forms in *α-ων*, *ε-ων* (*e.g.* *αὐτά-ων*, *αὐτέ-ων*, *ἀγορά-ων*, *ἀγορέ-ων*) point, however, to a consonant that has been dropped. It is a question, therefore, whether universally a Σ (cf. §. 128.), or, as the Sanskṛit and Zend lead us to expect, only in pronouns a Σ, but in other words of the first and second declension an N has been dropped, as in *μείζω* from *μείζονα*. According to this, *λύκων* would be to be derived from *λυκο-ν-ων*, *χωράων* from *χωρα-ν-ων*, but *τῶν* from *τοσων*, *τάων* from *τασων*.

† Old High German, see §. 246.

[G. Ed. p. 287.]

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN.	GOTHIC.
f.	*tâ-sâm,*	*â-oṇhaṅm,**	*τά-ων,*	*istā-rum,*	*t'-û,*	*thi-zô.*
m. n.	*tray-â-ṇâm,*	*thray-aṅm,*	*τρι-ῶν,*	*tri-um,*	*tri-û,*	*thriy-ê.*
f.	*prîtî-n-âm,*	*âfrîti-n-aṅm,*	*πορτί-ων,*	*messi-um,*	*awi-û,*	*anst'-e.*
m.	*sûnû-n-âm,*	*paṡv-aṅm,*	*ἰχθύ-ων,*	*pecu-um,*	*sun'-û,*	*suniv-ê.*
f.	*tanû-n-âm,*	*tanu-n-aṅm,*	*πιτύ-ων,*	*socru-um,*	....	*handiv-*
m. f.	*gav-âm,*	*gav-aṅm,*	*βο(F)ῶν,*	*bov-um,*	....	....
f.	*nâ-vâm,*	....	*να(F)-ῶν,*	....	....	....
f.	*vâch-âm,*	*vâch-aṅm,*	*ὀπ-ῶν,*	*voc-um,*	....	....
m. n.	*bharat-âm,*	*barĕnt-aṅm,*†	*φερόντ-ων,*	*ferenti-um,*	....	*fiyand-*
m.	*âtman-âm,*	*aṡman-aṅm,*	*δαιμόν-ων,*	*sermon-um,*	*akmen-û,*	*ahman-*
m.	*bhrâtṛī-ṇ-âm,*	*brâthr-aṅm,*‡	*πατέρ-ων,*	*fratr-um,*	. .	....

---

* This word often occurs, and corresponds to the Sanskrit आसाम् *â-sâm* "*harum*," "*earum*" (§. 56ᵇ.); from 𐬙𐬁 *tâ, tâoṇhaṅm* would be expected, which I am unable to quote. The compound (polysyllabic) pronominal bases shorten the last syllable but one; hence, 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬌𐬨 *aê-taṇhaṅm* not *aêtâoṇhaṅm,* as might be expected from एतासाम् *etâ-sâm.*

† Or, also, 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬀𐬌𐬨 *barantaṅm,* as in the Vendidâd Sâde, p. 131, 𐬯𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬀𐬌𐬨 *ṡaochantaṅm,* "*lucentium:*" on the other hand, also, frequently *ṡaochentaṅm.*

‡ This and the following genitives from bases in *ar* are clearly more genuine, and are more nearly allied therefore to the cognate European languages than the corresponding ones in Sanskṛit, which, in this case, has shortened *ar* to ऋ *ṛi,* and has then treated it according to the analogy of vowels. From 𐬥𐬀𐬭 *nar* frequently occurs *nar-aṅm,* with retention of the *a,* on account of the base being monosyllabic: on the other hand, *âthr-aṅm* from *âtar,* "fire," and 𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬌𐬨 *tisr-aṅm* "*trium,*" fem. for the Sanskṛit तिसृणाम् *tisṛi-ṇ-âm* (Gramm. Crit. r. 255.). From 𐬛𐬎𐬖𐬜𐬀𐬭 *dughdhar,* we find the form *dughdhĕr-aṅm* (cf. p. 208, G. Ed. Note †): the Codex has, however, *dugdĕr-anm* (p. 472, L. 2.). In general, in this word the readings *dughdhar* and *dugdar* are interchanged in various passages: the former, however, is the more common.

LOCATIVE.

250. The character of the plural locative [G. Ed. p. 288.] is, in Sanskṛit, सु *su*, which is subject to be changed into षु *ṣhu* (§. 21.), for which, in Zend, is found 𐬱𐬎 *shu* (§. 52.); while from सु *su*, according to §. 53., has been formed 𐬵𐬎 *hu*. The more usual form for *shu* and *hu* (for which, also, occur *shû* and *hû*) is, however, 𐬱𐬬𐬀 *shva*, 𐬵𐬬𐬀 *hva*, which leads to a Sanskṛit स्व *swa*. This appears to me to be the original form of the termination; for nothing is more common in Sanskṛit than that the syllables व *wa* and य *ya* should free themselves from their vowel, and then change the semi-vowel into a vowel, as उक्त *ukta* is said for *vakta* (see also §. 42.). The supposition, therefore, of the Indian abbreviation of the termination is far more probable than that of a Zend extension of it by a lately-added *a*, especially as in no other case does a similar aftergrowth admit of being established. But if स्व *swa* is the original form of the termination, it is then identical with the reflective-possessive base स्व *swa*, of which more hereafter.* The same relation which, in Latin, *si-bi* has to *su-bi* (which might be conjectured from *su-i*), or that *ti-bi* has to *tu-bi*, Sanskṛit तुभ्यम् *tu-bhyam*, the Greek dative-locative termination σι (σιν) has to the Sanskṛit सु *su*.†

---

* Therefore, in Zend, the locative 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬱𐬬𐬀 *thrishva*, "*in tribus*," is identical with 𐬙𐬭𐬌𐬱𐬬𐬀 *trishva*, "the third part," since the pronoun in the latter compound denotes the idea of part.

† Regarding the termination *ιν* of the pronoun of the 1st and 2d person see §. 222. From the Æolic form *ἀμμέσιν*, quoted by Hartung (p. 260) from Apoll., I cannot infer that *ιν* is an abbreviation of *σιν*: if it were so, the *ν* also in *ἡμῖν* would not adhere so firmly. It appears to me more suitable, therefore, to accord to the common declension an influence upon the transformation of the form of inflexion peculiar to the pronouns without gender, but of the highest antiquity; an influence which has penetrated further in *σφίσι* for *σφίν*.

[G. Ed. p. 289] 251. The bases in अ *a* add to that vowel, as in many other cases, an *i*; but from *a*+*i* is formed ए *ê* (§. 2.), to which the Greek *οι* corresponds; hence, *λύκοι-σι* = वृकेषु *vrikê-ṣhu*. Hence the *ι* in Greek has also passed over to the bases in *α-*, *η-*, either preserving its full value or subscribed, while in Sanskṛit the अ *a* remains pure; hence, जिह्वासु *jihwâ-su*, with which the locatives of names of towns best agree, as Πλαταιᾶσιν, Ὀλυμπίᾱσι, Ἀθήνησι (Buttmann, §. 116. R. 7. and Hartung, p. 461.).*

252. Like the Gothic, the Lithuanian has an unorganic difference between the terminations which mark the case in the masculine and feminine in the genitive plural: the first has the sound of *se*, and the latter of *sa*, with the original and more powerful *a*, which, in the masculine, has softened into *e*. The ending *sa* is plainly from the *swa*, assumed above (p. 267, l. 7.) to be the original form, from which it is made by rejecting the semi-vowel.

253. Here follows a general view of the Sanskṛit, Zend, and Lithuanian plural locatives, with the Greek datives:—

[G. Ed. p. 290.]

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	LITHUAN.	GREEK.
m.	*vṛikê-ṣhu*,	*vĕhrkaê-shva*,	*wilků-se*,	*λύκοι-σι*.
f.	*jihwâ-su*,	*hizvâ-hva*,	*ranko-sa*,	Ολυμπίᾱσι, *χώραι-σι*.
f.	*prîti-ṣhu*,	*âfrîti-shva*,†	*áwi-sa*,	*πόρτι-σι*.
m.	*sûnu-ṣhu*,	*paśu-shva*,	*dangů-se*,	*ἰχθύ-σι*.
m. f.	*go-ṣhu*,	....	....	*βου-σί*.
f.	*nau-ṣhu*,	....	....	*ναυ-σί*.

---

* The common termination *οις*, *αις* (*οι-ς*, *αι-ς*), formed by curtailing *οι-σι*, *αι-σι*, and so brought into agreement of sound with the third declension, is here lost, through its apparent connection with the Sanskṛit curtailed instrumental ending ऐस् *âis* (§. 219.), which had before required consideration, because the Greek dative is also used as the instrumental.

† I have no authority for the locative of the Zend bases in *i*, but it can only be analogous to that of the bases in *u*, which can be referred to in copious instances.

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	LITHUAN.	GREEK.
f.	*vâk-ṣhu,*	*vâc-sva?*	....	ὀπ-σί.
m. n.	*bharat-su,*	*brâtar-ĕ-shva?*	....	φέρου-σι.
m.	*âtma'-su,*	*aśma'-hva,**	....	δαίμο'-σι
m.	*bhrâtṛi-ṣhu,*	....	....	πατρά-σι.†
n.	*vachas-su,*	*vachô-hva,*‡	....	ἔπεσ-σι.

---

* Thus, in the Vend. Sâde, p. 499, 𐬎𐬱𐬀𐬵𐬬𐬀 *ushahva*, from 𐬎𐬱𐬀𐬥 *ushan*, and p. 500, 𐬛𐬁𐬨𐬀𐬵𐬬𐬀 *dâmahva*, from 𐬛𐬁𐬨𐬀𐬥 *dâman*.

† The *a* in this form is not, as is generally supposed, a conjunctive vowel, but rests on a transposition; as ἔδρακον for ἔδαρκον, and in Sanskṛit द्रक्ष्यामि *drakṣhyâmi*, "I will see," for दर्क्ष्यामि *darkṣhyâmi* (Sansk. Gramm. §.34^{b}.): thus πατράσι (compare τέτρασι) for παταρσι (compare τέσσαρσι), which, by preserving the original vowel, agrees with the Sanskṛit base *pitar* better than πατέρα, πατέρες, &c. The same applies to the dative ἀρνάσι, since the theme of ἀρνός has, as appears from the cognate word ῥήν, ἀρήν, ἀῤῥήν, rejected a vowel between the ρ and ν, which again appears in the dative plural in the form of an *a*, and removed from its place. The whole *REN* appears to be a transposition of *Ner*, Sanskṛit नर् *nar* (नृ *nṛi*), "a man," for ἀρήν properly means "male sheep." The *a* of ἀρνάσι is therefore etymologically identical with that of ἀνδράσι (comp. Kühner's complete Greek Grammar, §. 281. Rem. 2.). It is more difficult to give any accurate account of the *a* of υἱάσι: it is either the older and stronger form for the ε of υἱέσι, or this word must have had, besides its three themes (῾ΥΙΟ, ῾ΥΙ, ῾ΥΙΕΥ), a fourth, ΥΙΑΤ, from which came υἱάσι, as γόνασι from ΓΟΝΑΤ, the more prevailing co-theme of ΓΟΝΥ, which latter agrees with जानु *jânu*.

‡ In the Vendidâd Sâde, p. 499, we find the analogous plural locatives 𐬎𐬰𐬌𐬭𐬋𐬵𐬬𐬀 *uzirôhva*, and 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬋𐬵𐬬𐬀 *csapôhva*. Anquetil translates the former by "*au lever du soleil*," and the latter by "*à la nuit*." It is impossible to pronounce these forms aught but derivatives from themes in 𐬀𐬯 *aś* (𐬋 *ô*, §. 56^{b}.) Most of the cases of the latter word, which occurs very frequently in various forms, spring from a theme in 𐬀𐬭 *ar*, and the interchange of 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬭 *csapar* with 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬋 *csapô* is a similar case to that in Sanskṛit, where अहन् *ahan*, "day," forms some cases from अहस् *ahas* (from which अहो *ahô* in अहोभिस् *ahôbhis*, &c.); and together with

[G. Ed. p. 291.] "**Remark.**—From the bases in ΕΣ, to which in the dative εσσι (= अस्सु *as-su*) properly belongs, this form appears to have imparted itself to other bases terminating [G. Ed. p. 292.] differently, in which, for this case, an extension of the original theme by ες is to be adopted; which, in its origin, is identical with the abovementioned (§. 241.) plural increase to the base by *ir* (from *is* and *this*, from *as*), in Old High German forms, as *hûsir*, "houses," *chalpir* "calves," which are the plural themes, with which the nominative, accusative, and vocative are identical, and from which, in the dative, by the addition of the ending for that case, arises *husirum*, *chalpirum*; as, in Greek, *κύνεσ-σι*, *νεκύεσσι*, *πάντεσσι*, *γυναίκεσσι*, *πολίεσσι*, and others, from the unorganically increased themes ΚΥΝΕΣ, ΝΕΚΥΕΣ, &c., according to the analogy of 'ΕΠΕΣ. From the doubled Σ one may then be rejected (*ἀνάκτεσιν*, *πολίεσι*, *μήνεσι*), or the doubling of a Σ by itself be employed; as, for example, *νέκυ-σσι*, for *νέκυ-σι*. This,

---

with the theme अहस् exists another, अहर् *ahar*. The anomaly of the Sanskṛit "day" appears, in Zend, to have passed completely over to "night," as this latter word has also a theme in *n*, namely 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬥 *csapan*, of which the genitive pl. 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬂𐬨 *csafnaṅm*—analogous with अह्नाम् *ahnâm*, "*dierum*" (§. 40. relative to 𐬟 *f* for 𐬞 *p*)—is found in connection with the feminine numeral 𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬭𐬂𐬨 *tisraṅm*, "*trium*" (Vend. S. p. 246); for we read, l. c. §. 163., *aśnaṅmcha* (= अह्नाञ्च *ahnâncha*), *csafanaṅmcha* (read *csafnaṅmcha*), "of days and nights." In Sanskṛit, by the suffix अ *a*, the form अह्न *ahna*, derivative, but equal in its meaning, has arisen out of अहन् *ahan*, which, however, occurs only in compounds (as पूर्वाह्न *pûrvâhna*, "the early part of the day"), and in the adverbial dative अह्नाय *ahnâya*, "soon," "immediately," which, therefore, it is not necessary to deduce from the root ह्नु *hnu*, with the *a* privative. The Zend, however, whose night-nomenclature, in this respect also, is not outstripped by the Sanskṛit, produces, as it appears, by a similar mutation, 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬀 *csafna* from 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬥 *csapan*; whence we find the locative 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬉 *csafnê*, which might also be taken for the dative of 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬥 *csapan*, in most important particulars, is adopted by Thiersch, §. 128., for the developement of the forms in εσσι; only that he withdraws from the neuter bases described in §. 128., as ΒΕΛΕΣ, the Σ which belongs to them, and, by a supposition, proved to be erroneous, ΒΕΛΕ is made the theme: and he divides forms like ὄχεσφι into ὄχε-σφι instead of ὄχεσ-φι, and, by assimilation, derives ὄχε-σσι from ὄχε-σφι; while, as I believe I have proved, the forms ὄχεσ-φι and ὄχεσσι rest on entirely different case-suffixes (§. 218.), and have only the base 'ΟΧΕΣ in common with one another. An assimilation, however, may be remarked in γούνασ-σι, from γουνατ-σι, so that the first letter has assimilated itself to the second, not the reverse. In δέπασ-σι we shall leave it undecided whether the first Σ be primitive, and ΔΕΠΑΣ the theme (comp. γῆρας, §. 128.), or whether it has arisen out of τ, and so ΔΕΠΑΤ with ΤΕΡΑΤ, ΚΕΡΑΤ, belong to one class. If,

---

csapan, but that it is preceded (V. S. p. 163.) by the unequivocal adjective locative 𐬥𐬀𐬉𐬨𐬉 *naêmê* (from 𐬥𐬀𐬉𐬨𐬀 *naêma*, "half"). Compare, also, l. c. §. 149., where 𐬌𐬚𐬭𐬀 𐬀𐬳𐬥𐬉 𐬌𐬚𐬭𐬀 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬉 *ithra, aśnê, ithra, csafnê*, probably means "in this day," "in this night," with the locative adverb 𐬌𐬚𐬭𐬀 *ithra*, "here," in the sense of a locative demonstrative. To the theme 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬀 *csafna*, the plural of the same sound *csafna*, might also be assigned, which occurs l. c. §§. 330. 331., and in several places elsewhere: 𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬫𐬋 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬀 *thrayô csafna*, "three nights,' 𐬑𐬱𐬬𐬀𐬯 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬀 *csvas csafna*, "six nights," 𐬥𐬀𐬬𐬀 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬟𐬥𐬀 *nava csafna*, "nine nights," if here *csafna* be not (as in §. 231. Note ‡ it was considered to be) rather to be taken for the plural of 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬥 *csapan*, as neuter, since, as has been before observed, the Zend uses the gender of the substantive with great laxity, especially in the plural. For the frequently-occurring ablative 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬭𐬁𐬝 *csaparâṭ*, however, we cannot assume another theme *csapara*, but we must, if the reading be correct, admit that feminine consonantal roots in the ablative adopt also the broader ending, *âṭ* for *at*.

however, in all these forms, we allow only *σι* or *σιν* to be the case-suffix, and all that precedes it is referred to the true or unorganic increase of the base, it can therewith not be denied that not even to Homer himself, in forms like *ἔπεσσι*, not to mention unorganic forms like *κύνεσσι*, did the entire *εσσι* present [G. Ed. p. 293.] itself as pertaining to that which marked the case; for in the feeling of the speaker *ἔπεσσι* could present itself, during that period of the language, only as what it is, namely, as *ἔπεσ-σι*, while *ἔπεσος*, *ἔπεσι*, plural *ἔπεσα* and not *ἔπεος*, &c., were used in declension. But different from what has been here adopted is the assumption of Hartung (p. 260, ff.) and Kühner (l. c. §. 255. R. 8.), in the most material points following Greg. Cor. Æol. §. 35., relative to the production of the Greek plural datives. Kühner says (l. c.) "The character of the dative plural is ες (character of the plural) and *ι* or *ιν* (character of the dative singular), therefore, *εσι*(*ν*)." I, however, think *ες* not the character of number, but of the nominative plural, and connected with the nominative singular through its Σ: a union of the plural nominative suffix with the singular dative is, to me, not to be imagined. If it were so, how could neuter nouns, to which ες in the nominative is quite foreign, arrive, in the dative, at their identity of form with the natural sexes? It further deserves to be remarked, that, in Prâkṛit, the locative ending सु *su* frequently assumes an Anuswâra, and so adapts itself, by the form सुं *suṅ*, for *su*, to the Greek, *σιν*, for *σι*.

254. After laying down the laws of the formation of a single case, it may serve to facilitate the general survey if examples are adduced of the most important classes of words in their connected declension. We pass over here from the Sanskṛit, and go to the other languages in their order, according as they have, in the particular cases, most truly preserved their original form; and where one or other of them has departed entirely from the original

principle of formation, or by an unorganic increase to the base has entered the province of another declension, we there, in the place in question, exclude it from the comparison.

MASCULINE BASES IN *a*, GREEK IN *o*, LATIN IN *u*, *o*.

SINGULAR.

[G. Ed. p. 294.]

Nominative,	Sanskrit *vṛika-s*, Lithuanian *wilka-s*, Zend *vĕhrk-ô*, with *cha*, *vĕhrkaṡ-cha*, Greek λύκο-ς, Latin *lupu-s*, Gothic *vulf'-s*.*
Accusative,	Sanskrit, *vṛika-m*, Lithuanian *wilka-ṅ*, Zend *vĕhrkĕ-m*, Greek λύκο-ν, Latin *lupu-m*, Gothic *vulf'*.
Instrumental,	Sanskrit *vṛikê-ṇ-a*, Zend *vĕhrka*, Gothic Dat. *vulfa*, Lithuanian Instr. *wilkù*.
Dative,	Sanskrit *vṛikâya*, Zend *vĕhrkâi*, Lithuanian *wilkui*.
Ablative,	Sanskrit *vṛikâ-t*, Zend *vĕhrkâ-ṭ*, Latin *lup-o(d)* (see §. 181.).
Genitive,	Sanskrit *vṛika-sya*, Greek λύκο-(σ)ιο†, Zend *vĕhrka-hê*, Gothic *vulfi-s*, Lithuanian *wilkō*.

---

* The meaning is, in all these languages, the same, and so is the theme in its first origin. The connection of the Lithuan. *wilkas* with *vṛikas* rests on the very usual interchange of the semi-vowels *r* and *l*; and this latter goes through the whole of the European sister languages. The Gothic *vulfs* shews, moreover, the equally common interchange of gutturals and labials, and follows the rule for the alteration of letters (Asp. for Tenuis, see §. 87.). In Latin the same thing takes place with regard to the supply of the guttural by the corresponding labial; but *lupus* is further altered through the loss of the initial letter *V*, as is the Greek λύκο-ς: it may, however, be assumed, that this *v* is introduced into the middle of the word in being vocalized into *u*. While therefore, in Lithuanian, in *wilkas*, *l* and *k* are united, they are, in Greek, separated by *v*.

† M. Reimnitz, whose pamphlet, "The System of Greek Declension" (Potsdam, 1831), had not been seen by me before I completed the preceding Part of this book, unfolds (l. c. p. 122 passim) the same views concerning

the

Locative, [G. Ed. p. 295.]	Sanskṛit *vṛikê* (from *vṛika* + *i*), Zend *vĕhrkê* (*maidhyôi*, §. 196.), Lithuanian *wilkê*, Greek Dat. λύκῳ (οἴκοι §. 195.) Latin Gen. *lup'-ī*.
Vocative,	Sanskṛit *vṛika*, Zend *vĕhrka*, Lithuanian *wilkê*, Greek λύκε, Latin *lupe*, Gothic *vulf'*.

DUAL.

Nom.Acc.Voc.	Sanskṛit *vṛikâu*, Vêdic *vṛikâ*, Zend *vĕhrkâ*, Lith. Nom. *wilkù*, Voc. *wilku*, Greek λύκω.
Instr. Dat.Abl.	Sanskṛit *vṛikâ-bhyâm*, Zend *vĕhrkaêi-bya*, Greek Dat. Gen. λύκο-ιν, Lithuanian Dat. *wilka-m* (see §. 215.).
Gen. Loc.	Sansk. *vṛikay-ôs*, Zend *vĕhrkay-ô* (see Rem. 1.), Lithuanian *wilkû*.

PLURAL.

Nom. Voc.	Sanskṛit *vṛikâs*, Gothic *vulfôs*.*
Accusative,	Sanskṛit *vṛikâ-n*, Zend *vĕhrka-ṅ*, Goth. *vulfa-ns*, Greek λύκο-υς (from λύκο-νς, §. 236.), Lithuanian *wilkùs*, Latin *lupō-s*.

---

the Greek οιο and its connection with the Sanskṛit *a-sya* which I have, without being aware of his concurrence, brought forward in §. 189. I have, however, in this respect, already stated my views in my pamphlet "On the Demonstrative and the Origin of Case" (in the Transactions of the Hist. Phil. Class of the Academy of Science of Berlin for the year 1826, p. 100. Here I have only further to observe, that the Greek adj δημόσιος, from the root ΔΗΜΟ, is, in the suffix by which it is formed, probably connected with the genitive ending in the text; and is therefore remarkable with reference to the preservation of the *s*, which is lost in δήμοιο. With regard to the origin of δημόσιος from the genitive, let reference be made to the Latin *cujus, a, um*; and the identity of the Sanskṛit suffix of words like मनुष्य *manuṣhya*, "man," as a derivative from Manu, with the genitive ending ष्य *ṣhya* for स्य *sya*, as in अमुष्य *amu-ṣhya*, "*illius*."

* With reference to the Zend, see §. 231. Note ‡; and with regard to the Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian forms λύκοι, *lupi*, *wilkai*, see §. 228.

Instrumental,	Sanskrit *vṛikâ-is** (from *vṛikâ-bhis*), Vêda *vṛikê-bhis*, Zend *vĕhrkâ-is*, Lithuanian *wilka-is*. Prâkṛit *dêve-hiṅ* (from *dêva*, "God," see §. 220.), Greek *θεό-φιν*,† Gothic Dat. Instr. *wulfa-m* (§. 215).
Dat. Abl.	Sanskrit *vṛikê-bhyas*, Zend [G. Ed. p. 296.] *vĕhrkaêi-byô*, Latin *lupi-s* (*amici-bus* §. 244.), Lithuanian *wilka-m(u)s* (§. 215.).
Genitive,	Sanskrit *vṛikâ-ṇ-âm*, Zend *vĕhrka-n-aṅm*, Greek *λύκ'-ων*, Lithuanian *wilk'-û*, Gothic *wulf'-ê*, Latin *lupō-rum* (§. 248.),

---

* I take the liberty, in order to separate the base and the termination, to divide the diphthongs, as above in λυκο-υς; therefore one must here pronounce *vṛikâis*, and in Lithuanian *wilkais*, not as trisyllables, but as dissyllables.

† I have remarked at §. 217., but only as a conjecture, that the ending *φιν* in the plural is perhaps identical with the Sanskrit भिस् *bhis*, and the thence-derived Prâkṛit हिं *hiṅ*, and the Latin *bis* in *nobis*, *vobis*; and I will not advance more than a conjecture here, also, in comparing *θεό-φιν* with *dêvê-hiṅ*. This only is certain, that with the syllable भि *bhi*, which in Sanskṛit, lies at the bottom of the case-forms भिस् *bhis*, भ्यम् *bhyam*, and भ्याम् *bhyâm*, as their common root (see §. 215. passim), the Greek *φι* and *φιν* is also to be associated. I here willingly agree with M. Ag. Benary (Berl. Ann. July 1833, p. 51.), that *φιν* might be formed from the ending भ्यम् *bhyam* (§. 222.) by the contraction of य *ya* into *i* (as in *ἡμῖν*, *ἐμίν*, *τεΐν*, &c. §. 222.). The third possible supposition would be the derivation from the usual dative-ablative plural termination भ्यस् *bhyas*; again with the corruption of *s* to *ν*, as in the 1st person plural *μεν* from *μες*, and in the 2d and 3d person *τον*, *τον* from थस् *thas*, तस् *tas*. The fourth possible case would be the derivation from the dual termination भ्याम् *bhyâm* (§. 215.), and the changing this number of restricted plurality to that of unlimited plurality. I prefer, however, to consider *φιν* (*φι*) as from one of the multifarious terminations of the Sanskrit plural belonging to all declensions; therefore, from भिस् *bhis* or भ्यस् *bhyas*.

Locative, Sanskrit *vrikê-shu*, Zend *vĕhrkaê-shva*, Lithuanian *wilkůse*, Greek Dat. λύκοι-σι.

NEUTER BASES IN *a*, GREEK *o*, LATIN *u*, *o*.

SINGULAR.

Nom. Acc. Sanskrit *dâna-m*, Zend *dâtĕ-m*, Latin *donu-m*, Greek δῶρο-ν, Lithuanian *géra*, Gothic *daur'*.

Vocative, Sanskrit *dâna*, Zend *dâta*, Gothic *daur'*.

The rest as the masculine.

DUAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *dânê* (from *dâna* + *î*), Zend *dâtê*.

The rest as the masculine.

[G. Ed. p. 297.]

PLURAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *dânâ-n-i*, Vêdic *dânâ*, Zend *dâta*, Latin *dona*, Greek δῶρα, Gothic *daura*.

The rest as the masculine.

"Remark 1.—The Zend system of declension has received some valuable additions from the treatises published by Burnouf since the appearance of the First Part of this book, which I must lay before my readers.* First a dual case, viz. the genitive-locative, which I imagined to be lost in the Zend, as I had searched for it alone in vain, and could supply all the other dual endings in tolerable copiousness. M. Burnouf supplies this (*Yasna*, *Notes et éclaircissements*, p. CXXII.) by the expressions 𐬎𐬠𐬋𐬫𐬋 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬎𐬋 *ubôyô aṇhvô* which are to be twice found in V. S. p. 312, and on both occasions are rendered by Anquetil, whose translation is in this place particularly confused, "*dans ce monde.*" This translation might lead us astray so much the more easily, that 𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬎𐬋 *aṅhvô*, according to §. 187., might also be the singular genitive, which frequently occurs with a locative meaning. We await the elucidation which Neriosingh's Sanskṛit translation will give of this passage; but, for the present, content ourselves with the inferences deduced by Burnouf. 𐬎𐬠𐬋𐬫𐬋 *ubôyô*, according to that authority, corresponds with the Sanskṛit उभयोस् *ubhayôs* (*amborum, in ambobus*), with *ô* for *a*, probably, according to Burnouf's acute conjecture, through the influence of the preceding *b*, and with the loss of the concluding *s*. I am the more inclined to assent to Burnouf's opinion regarding the origin of the first *ô* of 𐬎𐬠𐬋𐬫𐬋 *ubôyô*, as I have been so fortunate as to find another example for the hitherto missing dual case, in which 𐬀𐬫𐬋 *ayô*, not 𐬋𐬫𐬋 *ôyô*, actually occurs; because, that is to say, no letter exercising the force of assimilation in question precedes the *a*—I mean the form 𐬰𐬀𐬳𐬙𐬀𐬫𐬋 *zaśtayô* (= Sanskṛit *hastayôs*), "in the hands," from 𐬰𐬀𐬳𐬙𐬀 *zaśta*, [G. Ed. p. 298.] in a passage of the Jzeschne, which has perhaps not yet been examined by M. Burnouf (V. S. p. 354.): 𐬐𐬀𐬚𐬁 𐬀𐬴𐬁𐬌 𐬛𐬭𐬎𐬘𐬆𐬨 𐬛𐬫𐬄𐬨 𐬰𐬀𐬳𐬙𐬀𐬫𐬋 *kathâ ashâi drujĕm dyaṅm zaśtayô,** which Anquetil (p. 192) translates by "*Comment moi pur, mettrai-je le main sur le Daroudj?*" It appears, however, that 𐬀𐬴𐬁𐬌 *ashâi* can as little be a nominative as 𐬰𐬀𐬳𐬙𐬀𐬫𐬋 *zaśtayô* a singular accusative; and I believe I am not wrong in the following literal translation: "How can I give the (Dæmon) Drudj into the hands of the pure (into the power)?"

---

* First, a review of this Part in the *Journal des Savans*, which refers particularly to the Zend; then the First Part of the First Volume of a Commentary on the Yaçna; lastly, a disquisition in the Nouveau Journal Asiatique, "*Sur les mots Zends et Sanscrits Vahista et Vasichta, et sur quelques superlatifs en Zend.*"

"Remark 2.—In the instrumental singular M. Burnouf admits the termination *ana* in bases in *a* (Yaçna, p. 98. passim), with *n* introduced, for the sake of euphony, according to the analogy of the Sanskrit एन *êna* (§. 158.). He rests this, among other forms, on that of 𐬨𐬀𐬉𐬯𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀 *maêsmana*, "*urinâ*," a word which had often attracted my attention, and from which I, in like manner, would have deduced instrumentals in *a-n-a* if I had not differed from Burnouf in the etymology of the same, as I make its theme terminate in *n*; and this word, which I remember to have seen only in the instrumental, I derive from the Sanskrit root मिह् *mih*, "*mingere*," by a suffix मन् *man*, according to the analogy of 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬯𐬨𐬀𐬥 *barĕsman*, from वृह् *vṛih*, "to grow," whose instrumental 𐬠𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬯𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀 *barĕsmana*, analogous with 𐬨𐬀𐬉𐬯𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀 *maêsmana*, occurs very frequently. M. Burnouf appears, on the other hand, to adopt a suffix *ma* in the word *maêsmana*, in which we think we cannot agree with him as long as we cannot supply any cases which must indubitably belong to a theme in *a*. If, further, some words, which in their theme terminate in 𐬀𐬯 *aś* (𐬋, Sanskrit अस् *as*), adopt *ana* in the instrumental form—M. Burnouf quotes, p. 100 note, 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬀 *mazana*, 𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬫𐬀𐬥𐬀 *śrayana*, and 𐬬𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬀𐬥𐬀 *vaṇhana;* still, in my opinion, bases in *a* may be assigned as the origin of these forms, and they can be divided *maza-na*, &c., only in as far as such forms have been already proved to belong to undoubted bases in *a*. But now we prefer dividing them *mazan-a*, so that the letter *s*, with which these themes originally terminate, is interchanged with a nasal, just as, [G. Ed. p. 299.] in Sanskrit, the words यकृत् *yakṛit*, शकृत् *śakṛit* change their *t* for *n* in the weak cases, and may substitute यकन् *yakan*, शकन् *śakan*; or as, in more remote analogy, the Greek, in the first person plural, has formed μεν from μες (मस् *mas*, "*mus*"). Besides this, M. Burnouf cites also the interrogative instrumental 𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬀 *kana*, "with what?" which is the only word that brings to my mind somewhat of conviction, and had struck my attention before, in passages like 𐬫𐬀𐬰𐬁𐬥𐬈 𐬫𐬀𐬰𐬥𐬀 𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬀 *kana yazna yazânê*, "with what offering shall I sacrifice?" (V. S. p. 481.) I have not, however, ventured to draw a grammatical deduction from this form, because the pronominal bases are prone to unite with one another, and because I believed I might assume that the same pronoun which is contained in अन *ana* and एन *êna* forms also the last element of 𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬀 *kana,* if from this base the instrumental only had been evolved or preserved, as has also occurred in the Sanskṛit अन *ana* and एन *êna* in but a few cases. For the rest, the Greek *κεῖνος* also appears connected with this 𐬐𐬀𐬥𐬀 *kana,* if it is looked upon as a theme, with which the instrumental must agree in sound, for *κεῖνος*, if not directly of interrogative meaning, is still plainly connected with the old interrogative base (comp. कश्चन *kaśchana,* "whoever."). Under these circumstances I cannot yet admit of any instrumentals in *a-n-a,* especially as also the bases in *i* and *u* (in which the Sanskṛit in the masculine and neuter likewise introduces a euphonic *n*) in the Zend, in words which we have noticed, have dispensed with a similar insertion (§. 160.). In another place (*Journal des Savans*), M. Burnouf deduces the frequently-occurring instrumental 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬁 *ashayâ,* "with purity," from the masculine theme 𐬀𐬴𐬀 *asha ;* and there would be accordingly 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀 *ashaya,* an instrumental form, at present standing alone in the Zend, which I hesitate to acknowledge, although it would be analogous to the Vêdic form mentioned in §. 158., स्वप्नया *swapnayâ,* if one derives this, with the Indian grammarians, from a theme स्वप्न *swapna.* But if instrumental forms of this kind, in the Vêdas or in the Zend, are not to be produced in other undoubted instances as in the case of adjectives in construction with masculine or neuter substantives, nothing prevents the assumption, that the form स्वप्नया *swapnayâ* belongs to a feminine theme स्वप्ना *swapnâ,* especially as the suffix न *na* occurs also in other abstracts in the feminine form ना *nâ,* and therefore स्वप्नया *swapnayâ* may be explained according to the analogy of तृष्णया *trish-*[G. Ed. p. 300.] *ṇayâ,* "with thirst." In every case I think I may deduce the Zend 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬌𐬌𐬀 *ashaya* from a feminine theme 𐬀𐬴𐬁 *ashâ,* as the Zend in general, in the substantive, passes readily from one sex to the other; and, for example, with a masculine base 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬭𐬀 *mańthra,* "a speech," occurs, also, a feminine 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬭𐬁 *mańthrâ.*

---

* The Codex has faultily 𐬀𐬯𐬁𐬌 *asâi* and 𐬛𐬭𐬬𐬘𐬆𐬨 *drvjem.*

"Remark 3.—For the genitive termination 𐬵𐬉 *hê* there also exists, as Burnouf has most satisfactorily proved, a form nearer to the Sanskrit *sya,* viz. 𐬵𐬌𐬌𐬁 *hyâ,* which, although rather rare in comparison with the more corrupt form *hê,* is still sufficiently frequent in some chapters of the Jzeschne to satisfy one perfectly of its signification, according to the proofs given by Burnouf. I too had remarked words with the ending 𐬵𐬌𐬌𐬁 *hyâ,* but in passages where Anquetil's translation was little adapted to bring to light the genitive nature of the same, which, besides, was very much obscured through its usual representative 𐬵𐬉 *hê,* and was, moreover, concealed from me under the appearance of an instrumental form. However, the termination *hyâ*—for which is sometimes found, also, 𐬑𐬌𐬌𐬁 *khyâ*—approaches so very near to the Sanskrit स्य *sya,* and agrees with it so precisely according to rule, as far as the unorganic lengthening of the *a,* that a single passage, with the accurate translation of Neriosingh, who, in the passages hitherto edited, follows the original word by word, would have led us to it. Such a passage is given, although with a different aim, by Burnouf in his Yaçna (Notes, p. cxxxix.), which we here annex, as it is interesting in other respects, also, for grammar:—
𐬐𐬀𐬯𐬥𐬁 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬡𐬁 𐬞𐬀𐬙𐬁 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬵𐬌𐬌𐬁 𐬞𐬀𐬊𐬎𐬭𐬬𐬌𐬌𐬋 𐬐𐬀𐬯𐬥𐬁
𐬑𐬉𐬧 𐬯𐬙𐬭𐬉𐬧𐬗𐬀 𐬛𐬁𐬝 𐬀𐬜𐬬𐬁𐬥𐬆𐬨 *kasnâ zańthwâ patâ ashahyâ paourvyô kasnâ kheng strencha dâṭ adhvânĕm.* Neriosingh translates this passage word for word, only that he renders *kasnâ,* "which man?" (here properly not more

than "who," for the idea of man is lost in the general signification of the whole,) not by को ना *kô nâ*, but simply, by को *kô*, as follows: को जननेः पिता पुण्यस्य प्रथमं कः सूर्यस्य तारकानाञ्च ददौ पदवीम् *kô jananêḣ pitâ puṇyasya prathamaṅ*[*] (किल सद्व्यापारत्वङ् कश् चक्रे *kila sadvyâpâratvan* [G. Ed. p. 301.] *kaś chakrê*, i. e. "*boni originem quis fecit?*") *kaḣ sûryasya târakânâncha dadâu padavîm* (किल मार्गन् तेषाङ् को ददौ *kila mârgan têṣhân kô dadâu, i. e.* "*viam ipsis quis dedit?*"). We translate from the Zend, "*Quis* (*qualis vir*) *creatione pater est puritatis* (or *puri*) *primus? quis* (*qualis vir*) *soli stellisque dedit viam?*" The Zend expression 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬬𐬁[†] *zaṅthwâ*, for which, in the lithographed codex, p. 351, is erroneously given 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬁 *zaṅthâ*, is plainly the instrumental of 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬙𐬎 *zantu*; which would correspond to the theme of a Sanskṛit infinitive, जन्तुम् *jantum*, as the latter is feminine, and to which I have, in another place, referred the ablative 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬬𐬁𐬝 *zaṅthwâṭ* (Gramm. Crit. p. 253.). This form is, besides, remarkable on this account, viz. that it is identical with the Sanskṛit instrumental gerund, which, from जन् *jan*, without a conjunctive vowel and without the euphonious suppression of the न् *n*, would sound जन्त्वा *jantwâ*. With regard, however, to the length of the concluding *a* of the Zend form, which is preserved contrary to the prevailing rule (see §§. 118, 158. and 160. p. 191 G. Ed., where, however, 𐬘𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬬𐬀 *jaṅthwa* is to be read for *zanthwa*), I do not attach any particular importance to that, because in the chapter from which this passage is taken *a*, originally short, is repeatedly to be found lengthened. The Sanskṛit जननेः *jananêḣ*, with which Neriosingh translates the Zend instrumental case, must be considered as an ablative, as this case often enters the department of the instrumental, and is also capable of expressing the preposition "through" (for example, Nal. XII. 89.). Considered as a genitive, जननेः *jananêḣ* would not correspond with 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬚𐬡𐬁 *zaṅthwâ*, which cannot possibly be a genitive, for the genitive of 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬎 *zantu* could only be 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬈𐬎𐬱 *zanteus*, or, also, 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬚𐬡𐬋 *zaṅthwô*, or 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬀𐬬𐬋 *zantavô* (see §. 187.), but in no case 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬚𐬡𐬁 *zaṅthwâ*. Add to this, also, that जननि *janani* is feminine, like the Zend 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬙𐬎 *zantu*, and पुण्यस्य *puṇyasya*, therefore, could no more pass as the epithet of जननेः *jananêḣ* than, in Zend, 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬁 *ashahyâ* could pass as the epithet of 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬚𐬡𐬁 *zaṅthwâ*. I will, however, as concerns the Zend, lay no great stress on this circumstance, since in it the genders of the substantive are constantly changing. M. Burnouf, who looks upon जननेः *jananêḣ* as a genitive, and refers पुण्यस्य *puṇyasya* to it, according to this interpretation justly takes objection to the पुण्यस्य *puṇyasya*, which does not agree with the gender of जननि *janani*, but he confirms, however, the reading expressly by the addition of a [G. Ed. p. 302.] *sic*. His translation runs, "*Quel est le premier père de la creation pure? qui a montré leur route au soleil et aux astres.*" I look with anxiety for M. Burnouf's further explanation of this passage, but expect from him rather information of value in other respects, than to find that he has succeeded in making the forms जननेः *jananêḣ* and 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬚𐬡𐬁 *zaṅthwâ* pass for genitives. Anquetil's traditionary interpretation sounds, in this place, very strange, but does not contradict my apprehension of 𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬚𐬡𐬁 *zaṅthwâ*: he makes the genitive 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬁 *ashahyâ* pass for the nominative, and does not, therefore, throw any light on the meaning of the termination 𐬵𐬫𐬁 *hyâ*; for, in the presumption that it was right, 𐬀𐬴𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬁 *ashahyâ* might, perhaps, have next been taken for an instrumental, and perhaps have been translated "father with purity." His translation is as follows: "*Quel est le premier père pur* qui a engendré? qui a donné*

---

[*] Perhaps the adverb प्रथमं *prathamaṅ*, "*primum*," is a corruption for प्रथमः *prathamaḣ*, "*primus*," which answers to the original, and is to be expected from the sense.

[†] Vide as to 𐬰𐬀𐬥𐬚𐬬𐬁 *zaṅthwâ*, p. 1244 G. ed.

---

* In other places (V. S. p. 385) Anquetil renders (p. 137) the words 𐬞𐬌𐬙𐬁

de lui même les astres qui ne sont pas a deux faces?" The sun is here quite left out of the question; and it must be acknowledged, that, as far as relates to etymology, it is very much obscured in this passage; we might identify, with reference to the form of 𐬑𐬆𐬢 *kheng*, this expression with the reflective pronoun 𐬑𐬀 *kha* (as in *kha-dâta*, "created of itself," which is often said of the stars, as of self-created lights), and consider it as the epithet of 𐬯𐬙𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬗𐬀 *stren-cha;* so that it would correspond as accusative plural to the Sanskrit स्वान् *swân*. It is here to be remarked, that in some chapters of the Jzeschne, 𐬢 *ng* is repeatedly found instead of a simple nasal, and, indeed, without regard to the organ of the following initial letter. So we read, in the V. S. p. 391, 𐬛𐬎𐬱𐬀𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬆𐬢 *dushacsathreng*,* 𐬛𐬎𐬱𐬱𐬫𐬀𐬊𐬚𐬥𐬆𐬢 *dusskyaôthneng*, 𐬛𐬎𐬱𐬛𐬀𐬈𐬥𐬆𐬢 *dushdaêneng*. Anquetil, indeed, renders these expressions as singular nominatives, "*ce roi mechant, qui fait le mal, attaché à la mauvaise loi*"; but they, together with [G. Ed. p. 308.] 𐬛𐬎𐬱𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬋 *dushvachanhô*, 𐬛𐬎𐬱𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬋 *dushmananhô*, refer to the plural 𐬛𐬭𐬆𐬔𐬬𐬀𐬙𐬋 *drĕgvatô*, and I have no doubt of their accusative nature: the whole passage, however, like many others in the Jzeschne, can be explained only with the help of Neriosingh's Sanskrit translation. We can but regret that the in other respects highly valuable elaborate exactitude of Burnouf's excellent Commentary leaves us no hope that he will come very soon to the elucidation of this and other passages, regarding which I am most curious. But to return to our 𐬑𐬆𐬢 *kheng*,

---

𐬞𐬀𐬙𐬁 𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬵𐬫𐬁 *patâ ashahyâ* rightly by *père de la pureté:* his translation is, however, little calculated to throw light on the connection of the passage referred to.

* The lithographed MS. has 𐬛𐬎𐬱𐬀 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬆𐬢 *dusa csathreng* as two words; the *a* is, however, clearly only a conjunctive vowel, to unite the prefix 𐬛𐬎𐬱 *dush* more conveniently with the following 𐬑𐬱 *cs*.

the 𐬑 *kh* makes no difficulty in this expression, even in its acceptation for the sun, for which, commonly, 𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭𐬆 *hvarě* is found (the Sanskrit स्वर् *swar*, "heaven,"), as 𐬑 *kh* is used very frequently for 𐬵𐬬 *hv* (see §. 35.); but we might here expect to find 𐬑𐬀𐬭𐬆 *kharě*, and may suppose that the 𐬢𐬔 *ng* has arisen out of *n*, and this letter out of *r*, as these liquids are easily interchanged, as is shewn in Sanskrit, by the connection of अहन् *ahan*, "day," with अहर् *ahar*, and, in the Zend, that of 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬥 *csapan*, "night," with 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬭 *csapar* (I write it thus, and not 𐬑𐬱𐬀𐬞𐬀𐬭𐬆 *csaparě*, designedly, see §. 44.). At all events I take 𐬑𐬆𐬢𐬔 *kheng* to be the accusative, if, indeed, it may not also be conjectured that the base 𐬵𐬬𐬀𐬭 *hvar* may have entirely lost its *r*, and that it may be 𐬑𐬆𐬢𐬔 *kheng* for 𐬑𐬆𐬨 *khem*, the accusative of a base 𐬑𐬀 *kha*. 𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬗𐬀 *śtren-cha*, also, according to my opinion, is the accusative, and not, as one might expect from the Sanskrit translation, the genitive plural, which more frequently occurs in the form 𐬱𐬙𐬁𐬭𐬄𐬨 *śtâranm*. Although, from this, 𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬆𐬥 *śtren* might easily be formed by contraction and combination with 𐬗𐬀 *cha*, I nevertheless prefer acknowledging in 𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬆𐬥𐬗𐬀 *śtrencha*, a secondary form of 𐬱𐬙𐬭𐬆𐬎𐬱 *śtreus*, explained in §. 239.; so that the nasal, here vocalized to *u*, is there retained, but the sibilant has been removed (comp. §. 239.); especially as, in other places also, 𐬛𐬁 *dâ* is found in construction with the accusative of the person, which has been given. In the Zend expression, 𐬀𐬜𐬬𐬁𐬥𐬆𐬨 *adhvânĕm*, the Sanskrit अध्वानम् *adhwânam* cannot fail to be observed (comp. §. 45.); but in the lithographed MS. we have instead of this, 𐬀𐬛𐬬𐬁𐬥𐬆𐬨 *advânĕm*, which is easily seen to be an error. This false reading appears, nevertheless, to be an ancient one, and widely diffused; and upon this is founded Anquetil's, or rather his Pârsî teacher's, interpretation, which is strangely at variance with Neriosingh's exposition; "*qui* [G. Ed. p. 304.] *ne sont pas a deux faces*," so that 𐬀 *a* is taken for the well-known privative particle, 𐬛𐬬𐬀 *dva* as the number two, and the last portion finds in the Sanskṛit आनन *ânana*, "countenance," its corresponding syllable.

FEMININE BASES IN *â*, GOTHIC *ô* (§. 118.).

Nominative,	Sanskṛit *dharâ*,* Greek χώρᾱ, Lithuanian *rankà*, Zend *hizva*, Gothic *giba*, Latin *terra*.
Accusative,	Sansk. *dharâ-m*, Latin *terram*, Zend *hizva-ṅm*, Greek χώρᾱ-ν, Lith. *ranka-ṅ*, Goth. *giba*.
Instrumental,	Sanskṛit *dharay-â*, Zend *hizvay-a*, Gothic Dat. Instr. *gibai* (§. 161.), Lithuanian *rankà*.
Dative,	Sansk. *dharây-âi*, Zend *hizvay-âi*, Lith. *ranka-i*.
Ablative,	Zend *hizvay-âṭ*, Latin *terra*(*d*).
Genitive,	Sanskṛit *dharây-âs*, Zend *hizvay-âo*, Greek χώρᾱ-ς, Latin *terrā-s*, Lithuanian *rankò-s*, Gothic *gibô-s*.
Locative,	Sanskṛit *dharây-âm* (§. 202.), Zend *hizvay-a*, Lithuanian *ranko-ye* (§. 197.).
Vocative.	Sanskṛit *dharê*, Zend *hizvê* (?), Greek χώρᾱ, Latin *terra*, Lithuanian *ranka*, Gothic *giba* (?).

DUAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc.	Sanskṛit *dharê*, Zend *hizvê* (§. 213.), Lithuanian Nom. *rankì*, Voc. *ránki*.
Instr. Dat. Abl.	Sanskṛit *dharâ-bhyâm*, Zend *hizvâ-bya*,† Greek Dat. Gen. χώρα-ιν, Lith. Dat. *ranko-m* (§. 215.).
Gen. Loc.	Sanskṛit *dharay-ôs*. [G. Ed. p. 305.]

---

* Means "earth," and is probably connected with the Greek χώρα, as aspirates are easily interchanged (Buttmann, §. 16. Rem. 1.). The root is धृ *dhṛi* (धर् *dhar*, §. 1.), "to hold," "carry;" whence, also, धारा *dhârâ*, which, by reason of the long vowel of its root, approaches nearer the Greek χώρα (§. 4.), although it does not signify earth.

† Without being able to quote this case in Zend bases in *â*, I still have no doubt of the genuineness of the above form, since I can prove by other cognate case terminations: 1. That the *â* is not shortened; and 2. also that an *i* is not introduced into the theme by the assimilative power of the termination; hence, *e. g.* in the instr. pl. 𐬔𐬆𐬥𐬁𐬠𐬍𐬯 *gĕnâbîs* (V. S. p. 308.) from 𐬔𐬆𐬥𐬁 *gĕnâ* "woman" (γυνή).

FEMININE BASES IN *i*.*

SINGULAR.

Nominative,	Sanskrit *prîti-s*, Zend *âfrîti-s*, Greek *πόρτι-ς*, Latin *turri-s*, Lithuanian *awi-s*, Gothic *anst'-s*.
Accusative,	Sanskrit *prîti-m*, Latin *turri-m*, Zend *âfrîtî-m*, Greek *πόρτι-ν*, Lithuanian *áwi-ǹ*, Gothic *anst'*.
Instrumental,	Sanskrit *prîty-â*, Zend *âfrîthy-a*, Gothic Dat. Instr. *anstai* (without case suffix, see §. 161.).
Dative,	Sanskrit *prîtay-ê* (or *prîty-âi*, §. 164.), Zend *âfrîte-ê*.†
Ablative,	Zend *âfrîtôi-ṭ*, Latin *turri-(d)*.
Genitive,	Sanskrit *prîtê-s* (or only with the feminine termination *prîty-âs*), Gothic *anstai-s*, Zend *âfrîtôi-s*, Greek *πόρτι-ος*, *φύσε-ως*, Lat *turri-s*.
Locative,	Sanskrit *prît-âu*, (or with the feminine termination only *prîty-âm*).
Vocative,	Sanskrit *prîtê*, Zend *âfrîti*, Greek *πόρτι*.

DUAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *prîtî*, Zend *âfrîtî*(?), Lithuanian Nom. [G. Ed. p. 306.] *awì*, Voc. *áwi*.

---

* It may be sufficient to give here the cases of a Sanskrit masculine in इ *i*, which differ from the feminine paradigma: from *agni*, "fire," comes the instrumental singular *agni-n-â*—whilst from *pati*, "master," comes *paty-a*, and from *sakhi*, "friend," *sakhy-â* (see §. 158.)—and in the accus. plural अग्नीन् *agnî-n*.

† Differing from what is stated in §. 164. p. 196. G. Ed., it is now my opinion that the 𐬈 *e* in 𐬁𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬈𐬉 *âfrîteê* does not represent the 𐬀 *a* of the original form 𐬀𐬟𐬭𐬍𐬙𐬀𐬫𐬉 *afrîtayê*, but is the contraction of *a* and *y*; as, for instance, in the Prakrit चिन्तेमि *chintêmi*, from चिन्तयामि *chintayâmi*. 𐬈 *e* is here a weaker form of *ê*=ए, and is more properly used to represent the latter than another vowel. With regard to the Lithuanian, see p. 218, Note †.

Instr. Dat. Abl. Sanskrit *prîti-bhyâm*, Zend *âfrîti-bya*, Greek Gen. Dat. *πορτί-ο-ιν*, Lithuanian Dat. *áwi-m* (§. 215.).

Gen. Loc. Sanskrit *prîty-ôs*, Zend *âfrîthy-ô* (?) (see p. 276. Rem. 1.).

PLURAL.

Nom. Voc. Sanskrit *prîtay-as*, Zend *âfrîthy-ô* (with *cha* "and" *âfrîthy-aś-cha*), Greek *πόρτι-ες*, Latin *turr'-ēs*,* Gothic *anstei-s*, Lithuanian *áwy-s*.

Accusative, Sanskrit *prîtî-s*, Zend *âfrîtî-s*, Greek *πόρτῑ-ς*, Gothic *ansti-ns*, Lithuanian *áwy-s*.

Instrumental, Sanskrit *prîti-bhis*, Zend *âfrîti-bîs*, Lithuanian *awi-mis*, Gothic Dat. Instr. *ansti-m* (§. 215.).

Dat. Abl. Sanskrit *prîti-bhyas*, Zend *âfrîti-byô*, Latin *turri-bus*, Lithuanian *awi-m(u)s* (§. 215.).

Genitive, Sanskrit *prîtî-n-âm*, Zend *âfrîti-n-aṅm*, Latin *turri-um*, Greek *πορτί-ων*, Lithuanian *awi-û*, Gothic *anst'-ê*.

Locative, Sanskrit *prîti-ṣhu*, Zend *âfrîti-shva* (or *âfrîti-shu*), Lithuanian *áwi-sa*, Greek Dat. *πόρτι-σι*.

NEUTER BASES IN *i*.

SINGULAR.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *vâri*, Zend *vairi*, Greek *ἴδρι*, Latin *mare*.

The rest like the masculine.

DUAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *vâri-ṇ-î*.

The rest like the masculine.

PLURAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *vârî-ṇ-i*, Zend [G. Ed. p. 307.] *vâr'-a*, Greek *ἴδρι-α*, Latin *mari-a*, Gothic *thriy-a* (from *THRI*, "three").

The rest like the masculine.

---

* Vide p. 1078 G. ed. as to *turrê-s* and similar forms.

MASCULINE BASES IN *u*.

SINGULAR.

Nominative,	Sanskrit *sûnu-s*, Gothic *sunu-s*, Lithuanian *sunù-s*, Zend *paśu-s*, Latin *pecu-s*, Greek *βότρυ-ς*.
Accusative,	Sanskrit *sûnu-m*, Latin *pecu-m*, Zend *paśû-m*, Greek *βότρυ-ν*, Lithuanian *sunu-ṅ*, Gothic *sunu*.
Instrumental,	Sanskrit *sûnu-n-â* (Vêda *prabâhav-â*, from *prabâhu*, §. 158.), Zend *paśv-a*, Gothic Dat. Instr. *sunau*.
Dative,	Sanskrit *sûnav-ê*, Zend *paśv-ê*, Lithuanian *sunu-i*.
Ablative,	Zend *paśaô-ṭ*, Latin *pecu-(d)*.
Genitive,	Sanskrit *sûnô-s* (from *sunau-s*), Gothic *sunau-s*, Lithuanian *sunaù-s*, Zend *paśeu-s* or *paśv-ô* (from *paśv-aś*), Latin *pecû-s*, Greek *βότρυ-ος*.
Locative,	Sanskrit *sûn'-âu*.
Vocative	Sanskrit *sûnô* (from *sunau*), Gothic *sunau*, Lithuanian *sunaù*, Zend *paśu*, Greek *βότρυ*.

DUAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc.	Sanskrit *sûnû*, Zend *paśû*, Lithuanian Nom. *sunù*, Voc. *súnu*.
Instr. Dat. Abl.	Sanskrit *sûnu-bhyâm*, Zend *paśu-bya*, Greek *βοτρύ-ο-ιν*, Lithuanian *sunu-m* (§. 215.)
Gen. Loc. [G. Ed. p. 308.]	Sanskrit *sûnv-ôs*, Zend *paśv-ô* (see p. 276. Rem. 1.)

PLURAL.

Nom. Voc.	Sanskrit *sûnav-as*, Greek *βότρυ-ες*, Zend *paśv-ô* (with *cha*, *paśvaś-cha*), Latin *pecū-s*, Gothic *sunyu-s* (for *suniu-s*, from *sunau-s*, §. 230.), Lithuanian *sùnu-s*.
Instrumental,	Sanskrit *sûnu-bhis*, Zend *paśu-bîś*, Lithuanian *sunu-mis*, Gothic Dat. Instr. *sunu-m* (§. 215.).

Genitive,	Sanskrit *sûnu-n-âm* Zend *paśv-aṅm,* Latin *pecu-um,* Greek *βοτρύ-ων,* Gothic *suniv-ê,* Lithuanian *sunʾ-û.*
Locative,	Sanskrit *sûnu-ṣhu,* Zend *paśu-shva* (or *paśu--shu*), Lithuanian *sunů-se,* Greek Dat. *βότρυ-σι.*

Remark.—Feminine bases in *u* in Sanskrit differ in declension from the masculine, exactly as, p. 305 G. Ed , प्रीति *prîti* f. differs from अग्नि *agni* m.

NEUTER BASES IN *u*.

SINGULAR.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *madhu,* Zend *madhu,* Greek *μέθυ,* Latin *pecu,* Gothic *faihu.*

The rest like the masculine.

DUAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *madhu-n-î.*

The rest like the masculine.

PLURAL.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit *madhû-n-i,* Zend *madhv-a,* Greek *μέθυ-α,* Latin *pecu-a.*

The rest like the masculine.

FEMININE BASES IN *î*. [G. Ed. p. 309.]

SINGULAR.

	Sanskrit.		*Zend.*
Nom.	*nârî,* "woman,"	*bhî-s,* "fear,"	*nâiri,* "woman."
Accus.	*nârî-m,*	*bhiy-am,*	*nâirî-m.*
Instr.	*nâry-â,*	*bhiy-â,*	*nâiry-a.*
Dat.	*nâry-âi*	*bhiy-ê,* or *bhiy-âi,*	*nâiry-âi.*
Abl.	*nâry-âs,*	*bhiy-as* or *bhiy-âs,*	*nâiry-âṭ.*
Gen.	*nâry-âs,*	*bhiy-as* or *bhiy-âs,*	*nâiry-âo.*
Loc.	*nâry-âm,*	*bhiy-i* or *bhiy-âm,*	*nâiry-a.*
Voc.	*nâri,*	*bhî-s,*	*nâiri.*

DUAL.

	Sanskrit.		Zend.
N. A. V.	*nâry-âu,*	*bhiy-âu,*	*nâirî* (see §. 213, p. 227.)
I. D. Ab.	*nârî-bhyâm,*	*bhî-bhyâm,*	*nâiri-bya.*
Loc.	*nâry-ôs,*	*bhiy-ôs,*	*nâiry-ô ?*

PLURAL.

N. V.	*nâry-âs,*	*bhiy-as,*	*nâiry-âo.*
Accus.	*nârî-s,*	*bhiy-as,*	*nâirî-s.*
Instr.	*nârî-bhis,*	*bhî-bhis,*	*nâiri-bîs.*
D. Abl.	*nârî-bhyas,*	*bhî-bhyas,*	*nâiri-byô.*
Gen.	*nârî-ṇ-âm,*	*bhiy-âm,**	*nâirî-n-aṅm.*
Loc.	*nârî-ṣhu,*	*bhî-ṣhu,*	*nâiri-shva* or *-shu.*

"**Remark.**—By the side of the declension of monosyllabic feminine bases in *î*, which may reject the terminations peculiar to the feminine alone, may be placed the Greek [G. Ed. p. 310.] *κῖς*, and a remarkable similarity of inflexion will be observed, as Nom. *bhî-s*, *κῖ-ς*, Gen. *bhiy-as*, *κῐ-ός*, Loc. Dat. *bhiy-i*, *κῐ-ί*, Acc. *strî-in*,† *κῖ-ν*, Voc. *bhî-s*, *κῖ-ς*. Plural: Nom. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ες*, Gen. *bhiy-âm*. *κῐ-ῶν*, Loc. Dat. *bhî-ṣhu*, *κῐ-σί*, Acc. *bhiy-as*, *κί-ας*, Voc. *bhiy-as*, *κί-ες*. I consider, however, this coincidence as accidental, but, nevertheless, an accidental coincidence of that nature, that can only occur in languages which were originally really one: and undoubtedly the terminations, whose common sound appears so startling, are historically connected. As far, however, as concerns the theme, I believe, with Kühner (§. 287.), that the ῑ of *κῖ* was not the original concluding radical letter of the word, but that a consonant has fallen out after the *ι*. I would rather, however, leave the question as to this consonant undecided, than assume that KI*F* is the true theme, and that the nominative was originally *κιFς*; for if *κιός*, *κιί*, in the form in which they have been received, be analogous to *Διός*, *Διί*, from *ΔιFός*, *ΔιFί*, still, to establish a theme KI*F*, a proof must be brought similar to that which really attaches to *ΔιFί* from its being found in inscriptions. And besides this, that which of itself is alone sufficient proof, the cognate Sanskṛit word दिव् *div*, "heaven" (§. 122.) likewise attests a digamma. All ground for supposing a theme KI*F* is, however, wanting, for the long *ι* could, as in the Sanskṛit भी *bhî*, and like the long *υ* in *ὀφρῦς*, be also the real final letter of the base, only that the long *î* in the Sanskṛit, except in compounds (for example गतभी *gata-bhî* m. f., "void of fear," जलपी m. f., "water-drinking," see Gramm. Crit. §§. 169. 170.), concludes only the feminine themes. We will therefore seek elucidation regarding the Greek *κῖς* in another way, through the Sanskṛit, and we find this, as it appears to me, through a like masculine base, which approximates closely to the *κί-ς*, as well in form as in meaning; namely, in कीट *kîṭa*, Nom. कीटस् *kîṭa-s*, "insect" "worm," which would lead us to expect in the Greek *κῖτος*, Acc. *κῖτον*, to which *κῖς*, *κῖν*, bear the same relation as *μέγας*, *μέγαν*, to the to be presupposed *μέγαλος*, *μέγαλον*. I do not consider it requisite to assume a theme ΜΕΓΑΤ, although the Sanskṛit महत् *mahat*, "great," might support it; but महत् *mahat* is a participial form, and its full and original form [G. Ed. p. 311.] (§. 129.) is महन्त् *mahant*, Nom. masc. महान्। *mahân*, which would correspond to the Greek *μεγων*."

---

* Or *bhî-n-âm*. Further, the longer case-terminations, which belong to the feminine (see §. 164.), are added at will to the monosyllabic feminines in *î*, *û*; for example, together with *bhiyê*, *bhruvê*, also *bhiyâi*, *bhruvâi*.

† Or, like the other monosyllabic words in *î*, with the termination *am*, *striy-am*.

FEMININE BASES IN *û*, *ῡ*.

SINGULAR.

	Sanskṛit.		*Greek.*
Nom.	*vadhû-s*, "wife,"	*bhrû-s*, "eye-brow,"	*ὀφρῡ́-ς*.
Accus.	*vadhû-m*,	*bhruv-am*,	*ὀφρῡ́-ν*.
Instr.	*vadhw-â*,	*bhruv-â*,	....
Dat.	*vadhw-âi*,	*bhruv-ê* (or *-âi*),	....

SINGULAR,

	Sanskṛit.		*Greek.*
Abl.	*vadhw-âs,*	*bhruv-as* (or *-âs*),	. . . .
Gen.	*vadhw-âs,*	*bhruv-as* (or *-âs*),	ὀφρύ-ος.
Loc.	*vadhw-âm,*	*bhruv-i* (or *-âm*),	ὀφρύ-ϊ.
Voc.	*vadhu,*	*bhrû-s,*	ὀφρῦ.
		DUAL.	
N. Ac. V.	*vâdhw-âu,*	*bhruv-âu,*	ὀφρύ-ε.
I. D. Ab.	*vadhû-bhyâm.*	*bhrû-bhyâm.*	ὀφρύ-ο-ιν.
G. L.	*vadhw-ôs,*	*bhruv-ôs.*	. . . .
		PLURAL	
N. V.	*vadhw-as,*	*bhruv-as,*	ὀφρύ-ες.
Accus.	*vadhû-s,*	*bhruv-as,*	ὀφρύ-ας.
Instr.	*vadhû-bhis,*	*bhrû-bhis,*	. . . .
D. Abl.	*vadhû-bhyas,*	*bhrû-bhyas,*	. . . .
Gen.	*vadhû-n-âm,*	*bhruv-âm* (or *bhrû-ṇ-âm*),	ὀφρύ-ων.
Loc.	*vadhû-ṣhu,*	*bhrû-ṣhu,*	ὀφρύ-σι.

Remark.—The identity of भ्रू *bhrû* and 'ΟΦΡΥ* is [G. Ed. p. 312.] sufficient proof that the length of the υ is organic (comp. §. 121.), and it is not necessary, therefore, to suppose a theme ΟΦΡΥϜ (comp. Kühner §. 289.) so as to consider ὀφρῦς as coming from ὀφρυϜς, and the long υ as a compensation for the rejected Ϝ, as perhaps μέλᾱς from μέλανς. That, however, Ϝ originally stood—for example, ὀφρύϜος—before the terminations now commencing with a vowel, though at a time when the language had not a Grecian form is shewn by the Sanskṛit *bhruv-as*; by which, at the same time, the shortening of the υ in this case is justified, for the Sanskṛit changes, that is to say in polysyllables, as well *υ* as *ῦ*, before vowel terminations, into a simple *v*; but in monosyllables, in order to avoid commencing with two consonants, or to gain a polysyllabic form, the semi-vowel has its corresponding short vowel placed before it, and thus is formed उव् *uv* (*ŭv*), as well from *u* as from *û*, as, under a similar condition, इय् from *i* and *î*: hence the two opposite forms, for example, *vadhw-as* (not *vadhuv-as*), "women," and *bhruv-as* (not *bhrw-as*), "the eyebrows;" as above, *bhiy-as* (not *bhy-as*), opposed to *nâry-as* (*nâriy-as*). In the dative plural the short *υ* of ὀφρύ-σι for ὀφρῦ-σι may be attributed to the effeminate habit of regularly shortening the *υ* before vowel terminations."

---

* The ο in ὀφρῦς is based on the peculiar disposition of the Greek to prefix a vowel to words which originally commenced with a consonant, to which I have already drawn attention in another place, and by which, among other things, the relation of ὄνυξ, ὄνομα, to नखस् *nakha-s*, नाम *nâma*, is shewn.

BASES IN *âu* (औ),*

	SINGULAR.	
	Sanskrit.	*Greek.*
Nominative,	*nâu-s,*	ναῦ-ς.
Accusative,	*nâv-am,*	ναῦ-ν.
Genitive,	*nâv-as,*	νᾱ(F)-ός.
Locative,	*nâv-i,*	νᾱ(F)-ί.
Vocative,	*nâu-s,*	ναῦ-ς.
	DUAL.	[G. Ed. p. 318.]
Nom. Acc. Voc.	*nâv-âu,*	νᾶ(F)-ε.
Instr. Dat. Abl.	*nâu-bhyâm,*	νᾱ(F)-ο-ῖν.
	PLURAL.	
Nominative,	*nâv-as,*	νᾶ(F)-ες.
Accusative,	*nâv-as,*	νᾶ(F)-ας.
Genitive,	*nâv-âm,*	νᾱ(F)ῶν.
Locative,	*nâu-shu,*	Dat. ναυ-σί.
Vocative,	*nâv-as,*	νᾶ(F)-ες.

"Remark.—I find no sufficient grounds, with Kühner, (l. c. §. 283.) to suppose that the base of the nominatives in *αυς*, *ευς*, *ους*, originally terminated in Ϝ, so that in the case before us it would be requisite to suppose a theme NAϜ: for even if the vocalization of Ϝ to *υ*, in order to facilitate the junction with a consonant following, did not surprise us—(forms like *ναϜς*, *ναϜσι*, could never occur);—still, on the other hand, the transition of the sound *υ* into its corresponding semi-vowel, in order to avoid the hiatus, is far more regular, and is required in the Sanskṛit according to the common rules of euphony. We will not therefore differ from the Indian grammarians, by the assumption of a theme नाव् *nâv* for नौ *nâu*, and गव् *gav* for गो *gô* (*bos*); although, if there were adequate reasons for it, the practice of the Indian grammarians would not restrain us from laying down गव् *gav* and नाव् *nâv* in the Sanskṛit as the true themes, which maintained themselves in this form only before vowel terminations, but before consonants have allowed the *v* to pass into a *u*, according to the analogy of the anomalous दिव् *div*, "heaven"; whence, for example, the instrumental plural द्युभिस् *dyu-bhis* for दिव्भिस् *div-bhis*, which would be phonetically impossible (Gramm. Crit. §. 208.). The Latin *navis* cannot compel us to lay down a theme *nâv* for the Sanskṛit and Greek, for the Latin base has extended itself by an unorganic *i*, as *śwan*, "dog," lengthened to *cani*; and therefore it exhibits in its declension nowhere *u*, but universally *v*.

---

* I give only the cases retained in the Greek.

[G. Ed. p. 314.] BASES TERMINATING WITH A CONSONANT.

SINGULAR.

	Sanskṛit.	*Zend.*	*Latin.*	*Greek.*
Thema,	*VĀCH,*	*VĀCH,*	*VŌC,*	ὈΠ.
Nom.	*vâk,*	*vâc-s,*	*voc-s,*	*ὄπ-ς.*
Accus.	*vâch-am,*	*vâch-ĕm*	*voc-em,*	*ὄπ-α.*
Instr.	*vâch-â,*	*vâch-a,*	....	....
Dative,	*vâch-ê,*	*vâch-ê.*	....	...*

---

* See Locative.

	Sanskrit.	*Zend.*	*Latin.*	*Greek.*
	SINGULAR.			
Ablat.	. . . .*	*vâch-aṭ,*	*voc-e(d),*	. . . .
Gen.	*vâch-as,*	*vâch-ô,*†	*voc-is,*	ὀπ-ός.
Loc.	*vâch-i,*	*vâch-i,*	D. *voc-i,*	D. ὀπ-ί.
Voc.	*vâk,*	*vâc-s ?*	*voc-s,*	ὄπ-ς.
	DUAL.			
N. Acc. V.	*vâch-âu,*	*vâch-âo,*	. . . .	. . . .
or	*vâch-â,*‡	*vâch-a,*	. . . .	ὄπ-ε.
I. D. Abl.	*vâg-bhyâm,*	. . . .	. . . .	D. G. ὀπ-ο-ῖν.
G. L.	*vâch-ôs,*	*vâch-ô ?*	. . . .	. . . .
	PLURAL.			
N. V.	*vâch-as,*	*vâch-ô,*†	*voc-es,*	ὄπ-ες.
Accus.	*vâch-as,*	*vâch-ô,*†	*voc-es,*	ὄπ-ας.
Instr.	*vâg-bhis,*	. . . .	. . . .	. . . .
D. Abl.	*vâg-bhyas,*	. . . .	*voc-i-bus,*	. . . .
Gen.	*vâch-âm,*	*vâch-aṅm*	*voc-um,*	. . . .
Loc.	*vâk-shu,*	*vâc-shva ?*	. . . .	D. ὀπ-σί.

"Remark 1.—I leave the terminations in [G. Ed. p. 315.] the Zend which commence with *b* unnoticed, since, contrary to my former opinion (§. 224. Note *), I look on the 𐬈 *e*, in forms like 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *raochebîs*, no longer as a conjunctive vowel; and therefore no longer attribute the said form to a theme 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗 *raoch*, but assume that 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *raochebîs*, and similar forms, have proceeded from bases in 𐬋 *ô* (from *aś* §. 56^b.); so that I look upon the 𐬈 *e* as a corruption of the *ô*, and to the form 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬫𐬋 *raochebyô* I place as anterior a lost form 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬋𐬠𐬫𐬋 *raochô-byô*.§ In a similar way

---

* Like the Genitive.

† With *cha*, "and," *vâchaś-cha*.

‡ See p. 230, Note *.

§ M. Burnouf, who has induced me, by his excellent pamphlet, cited at p. 276, on the Vahista (in the separate impression, p. 16, and following), to rectify my former views, leaves, p. 18 note, the question still undecided, whether forms like 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *mazebîs*, 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *manebîs*,

𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱

[G. Ed. p. 316.] I find, in the Prâkṛit (Urvasi, by Lenz, p. 40.), अच्छरेहिं *achharêhiṅ* for अच्छरोहिं *achharôhiṅ* (Sanskṛit *apsarôbhis*); and if this form is genuine, then the 𐬆 *e*, in forms like 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬆𐬠𐬍𐬱 *raochebîs*, appears to stand for 𐬉 *ê*, as generally many interchanges between 𐬆 *e* and 𐬉 *ê* occur, although in the case before us the 𐬆 *e* is very constantly written, and 𐬉 *ê* has not yet been pointed out in its place. If it is further considered that we often find 𐬫𐬆 *ye* for 𐬫𐬋 *yô*, "which," 𐬐𐬆 *ke* for 𐬐𐬋 *kô*, "who?" and in the pronoun of the 2d person in the plural also 𐬬𐬆 *ve* for 𐬬𐬋 *vô*; and, finally, in the pronoun of the 1st person 𐬥𐬆 *ne* for 𐬥𐬋 *nô*; then we see the change of the 𐬋 *ô* with 𐬆 *e* is sufficiently ascertained, although it appears to be restricted to the end of words of a monosyllabic form; and in these the practice of writing the 𐬋 *ô* is the prevailing one, while before termi-

---

𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬆𐬠𐬍𐬱 *vachebîs*, 𐬭𐬀𐬊𐬗𐬆𐬠𐬍𐬱 *raochebîs*, have so arisen from the bases 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬋 *mazô*, &c., that the 𐬋 *ô* (𐬀𐬵 *aś*) is suppressed, and 𐬆 *e* then introduced as conjunctive vowel; or whether, before the *ô* (from *aś*) only, the *ś* has been rejected, and the preceding *a* with an epenthetic *i* united with an *e*. In the former case I should not have been entirely wrong, from the analogy of *raoch-e-bîs*, to deduce forms like *vâch-e-bîs*. I consider, however, the last view as the right one, only that I prefer letting the *ô* from the pre-supposed original form, *manô-bîs*, *raochô-bîs*, be changed in its whole force into 𐬆 *e*, rather than reduce it into its elements, and mix the first of the said elements (*a*) with a conjoined *i*: for the derivation of *manebîs* from *manäibîs* from *manabîs*, for *manasbîs*, would extend to the Sanskṛit form मनोभिस् *manôbhis*, which originally may have been *manarbhis* (*manas-bhis* was never possible). But I believe that in the Zend the form *ebîs* really preceded the form *ôbîs*. M. Burnouf, in his review in the *Journal des Savans* (in the separate impression, pp. 30, 31), calls attention to a form 𐬬𐬂𐬖𐬲𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâghzhbyô*, for which is once found, in the Vend. Sâde, pp. 69 and 70, 𐬬𐬂𐬖𐬆𐬲𐬆𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâghĕzhĕbyô*' once 𐬬𐬂𐬖𐬲𐬆𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâghzhĕbyô*, and once 𐬬𐬂𐬖𐬆𐬲𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâghĕzhbyô*, which, nations beginning with *b* as yet no *ô* has been pointed out; so that *b* appears to be as repugnant to a preceding *ô* as favourable to a following *ô*, if the conjecture of Burnouf, mentioned at p. 297, G. Ed., is well-founded. On this point I was not yet clearly informed, when, at §§. 224. and 242., I inconsiderately imagined I could deduce *vachô-bya, vachô-bîs*, from 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬋 *vachô* (from *vachas̆*). Instead of this should be read 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬫𐬀 *vache-bya*, 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *vache-bîs*; and besides this, in the locative singular, 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬵𐬌 *vachahi* for 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬌 *vachanhi*; since the nasal to be prefixed to the *h*, according to §. 56ᵇ., falls away when the vowel which follows the *h* is *i*, which has been already indicated in the paragraph quoted, but since then fully proved by Burnouf. [G. Ed. p. 317.] Besides, there really occurs, also, in one passage (where, unfortunately, the lithographed MS. is faulty, and is therefore

---

which, with the conjunctive vowel 𐬈 *ĕ* (see §. 30.) introduced in different ways, plainly represent one and the same word, and have proceeded from 𐬬𐬁𐬖𐬲𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâghzhbyô*, which itself never occurs. Although these forms, which had struck me likewise, clearly belong to a theme which means "discourse," and is connected with our *vâch*, I would still rather not, with Burnouf, derive it from *vâch;* so that the nominative of this, 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬯 *vâcs*, raised to a secondary theme, would be contained therein. We dare not, without further authority, attribute to the Zend such a malformation, although it derives its superlatives in 𐬙𐬈𐬨𐬀 *tĕma* from the masculine nominative, instead of from the theme. But Anquetil, in his Glossary, gives a form *vakhsenghê*, "*parole utile*," which we ought probably to read 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬉 *vacsanhê* (as dative), if not with long *a* 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬯𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬉 *vâcsanhê*. This latter form would belong to a theme 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬯𐬋 *vâcsô* (*vâcsas̆*); from which, in the dat. abl. pl., 𐬬𐬁𐬖𐬲𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâghzhbyô* (*vâghĕzhbyô*, &c.) might proceed for 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬯𐬠𐬫𐬋 *vâcsbyô;* as with 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *mazebîs*, 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬈𐬠𐬍𐬱 *manebîs*, occur also 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬠𐬍𐬱 *mazbîs*, 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬠𐬍𐬱 *manbîs;* for the 𐬯 *s* of 𐬬𐬁𐬗𐬯𐬋 *vâcsô* must, as Burnouf has shewn, in contact with *b* become 𐬲 *zh*.

impossible for me to use) the locative 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬵𐬌 *vachahi*; that is to say, in the Vend. S. p. 173, where, for 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬵𐬉𐬗𐬁 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬵𐬉𐬗𐬁 *manahêchâ vachahêchâ*, is to be read 𐬨𐬀𐬥𐬀𐬵𐬌𐬗𐬁 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬵𐬌𐬗𐬁 *manahichâ vachahichâ*. In a Grammar, the lost acquaintance with which is again to be restored, oversights of this kind will, I trust, be excused in the first labourers; and if, for example, Rask gives to the word *paiti* the genitive *paitôis*, while, according to §. 180. p. 196, Note †, *patôis* is to be written, still the form *paitôis* was, in its time, instructive in the main, and first taught me that the Sanskṛit genitive termination *ê-s* corresponds to the form *ôis* in the Zend. If, too, Rask has incorporated in his scheme of declensions the ablative *paitôit* (for *patôit*), this was indeed a new error, but also a new advantage for the Zend Grammar in its then state, and brought to light a new and important fact, which I believe I was the first to discover; namely this, that bases in *i* form their ablative in *ôit*, for which the proofs in the Zend-Avesta, as much as I have of it, are neither numerous nor easily found. I make this remark because M. Burnouf, as it appears to me, speaks too unfavourably of such theoretic formations. As far as I am concerned, I believe I may assert that my communications regarding Zend Grammar are founded on careful reflection. I could not, however, perfectly conclude my considerations, and I am very ready to complete and adjust them through those of M. Burnouf. For in this book also, in regard to Zend Grammar, one must carefully distinguish the disquisitions given in the text from the general comparison added at the end of each rule regarding case. In the former I give only those Zend forms which I have seen, and I thence deduce theoretic laws: in the latter I seek to make the deductions from the inquiries pursued in the text evident in one select example. I am perfectly sure of the prevailing majority of the forms given in the tables, and can produce abundant examples of them. I have marked some as questionable, and shewn the limits of the probability of others, in notes; and if an error has crept into the forms spoken of, and by me believed to be correct, it will give me pleasure to be able hereafter supplementarily to correct it. The form 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬀𐬢𐬵𐬌 *vachaṇhi* was, however, only in a measure a theoretic formation; and I should not have ventured to [G. Ed. p. 318.] exhibit it if I had not observed, in other words of the same declension, *i.e.* in other bases terminating with a consonant, the locative, which has entirely escaped Rask.

"Remark 2.—One might consider the *ο* of *ὁποῖν* instead of a conjunctive vowel, as has been stated above (see §. 221.), as a property of the base, *i.e.* as an unorganic extension of it; or, in other words, regard it as a transition from the third to the second declension; a declaration which must then naturally extend itself to the dual termination *οιν* of the whole third declension (*ποσίο-ιν*, *βοτρύο-ιν*, *δαιμόνο-ιν* like *λύκο-ιν*), and to all cases in the formation of words and arrangement of the same, where we have represented an *ο* foreign to the proper base as conjunctive vowel. According to this, forms like *μελιτόεις*, *μελιτοπώλης*, *φυσιολογία*, *βοτρυόεις*, *βοτρυόδωρος*, would be, under the presupposition of the bases ΜΕΛΙΤΟ, ΦΥΣΙΟ, ΒΟΤΡΥΟ, to be divided into *μελιτό-εις*, and would lead us to expect the nominatives *μελιτο-ν*, &c., which are not to be found. The statement here given has this in its favour, that similar cases occur also in cognate dialects, since in general that declension which is the most in vogue and most used, is prone, in certain cases, to receive into itself the other declensions, which annex to their original base the final letters of the bases of the declension more in use. The origin of *ὁποῖν* from 'ΟΠΟ, of *φερόντοιν* from ΦΕΡΟΝΤΟ, was as it were the first commencement of the disease, which came to its full developement in the Pâli; since in this language, which otherwise closely resembles the Sanskṛit, the bases which end with consonants are declined which is rather to be called a *ỵ* than an *i**; and it may be said that in *schal*ᵇ and *ogon*ᵇ one hears quite as much of a *ỵ* as can be heard of this semi-vowel after a consonant preceding it. Hence we mark it with a *ỵ*, and write the above words *schalỵ*, *ogonỵ*, Old Sclavonic *ognỵ*. In the words, too, which end with it in the uninflected nominative and accusative singular, it occurs in several oblique cases as a distinct proper *y*, *e.g.* in *zarỵa*, "*regis*," *zarỵu*, "*regi*," from *zarỵ*, "*rex*," "*regem*." On the consonant which precedes it this *ỵer* has an influence which renders its pronunciation more mild, because its sound is somewhat broken by the *ỵ*, which throws back its sound. Etymologically the *ỵer* corresponds either to a final *i* of the cognate languages, as in *ỵestỵ*, "he is" (अस्ति *asti*, ἐστί, Lithuanian *esti*), *kostỵ*, "bones" (अस्थि *asthi*), or in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine substantives and adjectives, to a *ỵ* (य् *y*), from which a vowel has dropped; for the theme of *sinỵ*, "*cæruleus*," concludes neither with *i* nor with *y*, but with *yo* (euphonically *ye*, see *n.*); whose final vowel, suppressed in the nominative and accusative masculine, appears, however, in the feminine *sinỵa*, in its extension to *a*, while the neuter *sine* for *sinỵe* has rejected the *y*.

(*k.*)—The hard *ỵerr* is represented by Gretsch as a semi *o*, but by Reiff, more correctly in my opinion, it is compared to the French silent *e* and the Hebrew *schva*: it is therefore, to use the expression, equivalent to "nothing"; and one cannot perceive of what vowel the small, still perhaps remaining vowel part of it is the residue. Consonants preceding it have a stronger and free pronunciation; [G. Ed. p. 339.] and Kopitar (p. 5) tells us that they are pronounced before it sharp, and without echo, and that it is for this reason called the hard *ỵerr*, and not on account of its own pronunciation. We require, therefore, in the

---

* In the Carniolan dialect this sound has mostly disappeared; but where it has remained it is also written by a *ỵ*; as, *konỵ*, "horse."

Roman character, no substitute for this mark, and Dobrowsky also omits it at the end of words. Etymologically, however, this *ỵerr* always represents a suppressed mute vowel, only not always an *o*, nor, as Grimm conjectures (in his valuable Preface to Wuk's Servian Gramm. p. xxxiv) a *u*. Rather, each of the three short fundamental vowels—*a* (as represented also by *o*, *e*), *i*, *u*, (for which may stand *y*, *o*),—is very frequently dropped at the end of words; and although the *i* is seldom entirely suppressed, more generally throwing back its sound as *ỵ*, nevertheless the vowel suppressed after the *m* of *rabo-m*, "*per servum*," and in Russian replaced by *ỵerr*, is clearly, as we gather from the Lithuanian, an *i*.

(*l*.)—I* believe I may assert, that in the whole extent of the structure of the Sclavonic language, at least in all the conditions of its noun and verb, not a single final consonant occurs after which some termination, which, through the cognate languages can be pointed out as beginning with a vowel, has not been dropped. Thus, the base *NEBES*, "*cœlum*," forms, in the genitive plural, likewise *nebes*, but the vanished termination is, in Sanskṛit, आम् *âm* (नभसाम् *nabhasâm*, "*cœlorum*"), Greek *ων* (*νεφέ(σ)ων*), Latin *um*, Gothic *ê*. The real final consonants, however, which, in the truly-preserved elder dialects of the Indo-European family, stand as the foundation of the word, have utterly disappeared in Sclavonic polysyllables; *e.g.* from अस् *as*, *ες* is formed, in the nominative plural, *e* (*ε*); and *synov-e* answers to forms like सूनवस् *sûnav-as*, *βότρυ-ες*.

(*m*.)—As far as regards the writing of those consonants which, in the Sclavonic alphabet, properly correspond to the Roman, we express the sound of the French *j* (*zivỵete*, in the Carniolan *sh*), as in Zend (§. 65.), by *sch*, that of our German *sch* (=ष्) by *sh* as in Sanskṛit, and also as, in Sanskṛit, the *tsch* by *ch:* for the sound of the Greek ζ (=*ds*) we retain ζ, and use *z* for the sound of our German *z* (=*ts*): for χ we write *ch*. In regard to etymology, it is important to call attention to the relation of this letter to sibilants, by means of which *snocha*, "daughter-in-law," corresponds to the Sanskṛit स्नुषा *snushâ*. *Ch* also, in declension and conjugation before certain vowels, passes into *s* [G. Ed. p. 340.] (Dobr. pp. 39, 41), and in some cases into *sh* (Dobr. 41.). Finally, in preterites like *dach*, "I gave," *dachom*, "we gave," the *ch* returns to the *s* (स् *s*, Σ) whence it has proceeded, in the cases where a personal ending beginning with a *t* follows it; hence, *daste*, "ye gave," *dasta*, "ye two" and "they two gave."[*] As the vowels exercise a multifarious influence in the transformation of gutturals preceding them, we will further remark that the *ch* under discussion maintains itself in the 3d person plural before *û*, but before *a* appears as *sh*; hence, *dasha* or *dachû*, "they gave."

---

* Cf. §. 783. Remark.

(*n.*)—[†]For the semi-vowel *y* (य् *y*) the Cyrillian alphabet gives the Greek ι, excepting in the cases for which the inventor of the character has provided by particular letters set together according to their value, which, at the same time, express the *y* with the following vowel; that is to say, *ya* is never written by two letters. It would, however, for this reason, be wrong to assume a vowel *ya*, as this syllable, however it may be written, still always unites in itself two sounds. For *ye*, also,

---

[*] Dobrowsky has, however, as it appears to me, not perceived the irrefragable connection between the *ch* of *dach* and the *s* of *daste*, for he considers the *ch* and *ste*, &c. as personal terminations (pp. 264. 383. 397); and hence he nowhere informs us that *ch* before *t* passes into *s*. More on this subject when we come to the verb.

[†] The vowels mentioned here, preceded by *y*, are, with the exception of ѥ *ye*, and ѣ *yĕ*, nasalised vowels (see §. 783. Remark); and hence *pyaty*, "five," must be pronounced *pańty* (in the original character ПѦТЬ).

Cyril has provided by a simple sign, and *yû* is expressed by an *o* in conjunction with an *ι*. But *y* often appears in Sclavonic as a dialectic addition before vowels foreign to the cognate languages. Compare *yesmy*, "I am," *yam* (for *yadmy*), "I eat," *pyaty*, "five," *desyaty*, "ten," *yedin*, "one," with the corresponding Sanskṛit forms, *asmi*, *admi*, *panchan*, *daśan*, *âdi* (*primus*). An *o* which follows is, in accordance with similar forms which we have observed in the Zend and Lithuanian (§. 137. and p. 174, Note*), changed into *e* through the influence of a *y* preceding it. In like manner, in accordance with the Zend and Lithuanian, the *y*, after it has assimilated a vowel following it, has often itself disappeared, and has left behind only its effect, and thereby the proof of its former existence.*

---

* Dobrowsky does not express himself with sufficient clearness regarding this form, when he says (cap. II. §. iii.) that *o* after *y* and liquid consonants is changed into *e*. According to this, one would believe that, besides *y*, certain other consonants had the power of changing an *o* following them into *e*. Dobrowsky understands—which, however, as far as I know, he nowhere expressly says—under "*consonæ liquidæ*," those which, in consequence of a following *yer* (*y*), have retained a more flowing and softer pronunciation; while he calls the consonants without *yer* "*consonæ solidæ*" (comp. l. c. p. 267); so that no consonant is by nature and of itself alone liquid, but receives this quality through a following *yer* (a *y* without a vowel). Thus, in Dobrowsky's second masculine declension, the consonants *r*, *ch*, and *ζ*, in *zary*, "king," *vrachy*, "physician," and *knyaζy*, "prince," are liquid. But as these words in the instrumental form *zarem*, *brachem*, *knyaζem*, Dobrowsky ascribes the *e* for *o* to the influence of a liquid consonant; while, according to my opinion, the consonants in these forms have no concern whatever in transforming *o* into *e*, but for *zarem*, &c. *zaryem* must originally have stood. And as in this form the *y* is the full semi-vowel, not entirely without a vowel sound, and therefore not the expression of the *yer* without a vowel which softens the consonant preceding it—as in the abbreviated nominative *zary*—so the *r* also, in *zaryem*, was not liquid, and has not, according to my opinion, become liquid after the dropping of the semi-vowel; at least, I find it nowhere stated

[G. Ed. p. 341.] 256. We must now, in order to be able to compare the true case-suffixes of the Old Sclavonic with those of the cognate languages, first of all endeavour to ascertain the final letter of the kinds of base which occur, as they have for the most part been rubbed off in the singular nominative, whence it has appeared as if these letters, where they again present themselves in the oblique cases, either belonged to the case termination, or were an addition equally foreign to the base and to the termination, which has been termed "augment" by Dobrowsky. After becoming [G. Ed. p. 342.] acquainted with the true base, the case terminations assume, in many points, an entirely different shape from what Dobrowsky has represented (p. 460), with whom we cannot concede to the neuter a nominative termination *o* or *e*, but perhaps the advantage of having preserved, in preference to the masculine, the final vowel of the theme in this case. For the practical use of the language, and to keep simply within the limits of the Sclavonic language, all might, notwithstanding, be assumed as inflexion which is usually represented as such. It is not, however, here our object to consider those syllables as supplying the place of grammatical relations which present themselves to the feeling of the speaker as such, but only those which may be so traced through the history of the language, and which, for thousands of years, have subsisted as Grammatical forms.

257. To the masculine and neuter bases in अ *a* correspond, in the Old Sclavonic as well as in Greek, bases in *o*,* which vowel has disappeared in the nominative and

---

stated that the *r* and other consonants, in forms like *zarem*, *knyaζem*, *golûbem*, *lebedem*, are differently pronounced from what they are in *pirom*, *voζom*, *lobom*, *adom*, of Dobrowsky's first masc. declension. The difference in the two classes of words is only this, that the former have a *ỵ* for the last letter but one of their theme, which, by the power of assimilation, has changed the following *o* into *e*, which *e*, after the *ỵ* has been dropped, does not again become *o*.

* Dialectically the older *a* has, in certain cases, maintained itself, as in

accusative singular: so the corresponding *a* has disappeared in Gothic, except in the neuter (as Gothic *blinda-ta*, "*cæcum*," in contrast with *blind'-s*, "*cæcus*"): it has also maintained itself frequently in the beginning of compounds in the Gothic and Old Greek, where, according to the oldest principle, the naked theme is required; as, *nov*, "*novus*," appears in many compounds as *novo* (*novo-grad*, "new-town"), but is then not to be considered as the neuter *novo*, "*novum*," but as the common theme [G. Ed. p. 343.] of the masculine and neuter, in which as yet no difference of sex is pointed out. The clearest proof that the class of nouns under discussion corresponds to the Indian, Lithuanian, and Gothic nouns in *a*, is afforded by their feminine bases in *a* (for आ *â*); so that to the form *rab* (for *rabo*), "servant," corresponds a feminine *raba*, "a maid": that is to say, all Old Sclavonic primitive adjectives, *i. e.* those with an indefinite declension, correspond to the Sanskṛit in *a-s*, *â*, *a-m*, Greek *ο-ς*, *η*(*α*), *ο-ν*, Latin *u-s*, *a*, *u-m*; much as one might be led astray by outward appearance to seek in the adjectives, which in the nominative masculine end in *ỵ* (*ỵer*), and in the neuter in *e*, as *siny*, "*cæruleus*," *syne*, "*cæruleum*," an analogy to Latin adjectives like *miti-s*, *mite*.

258. But I recognise in adjectives like that just mentioned, and in similarly-constituted substantives, as *knỵaζỵ*, "prince," *more*, "the sea," bases of such a nature as, without the euphonic form mentioned at §. 255. (*n.*), must have terminated in *ỵo*, whence *ỵe*; and hence, in the nominative masculine—according to the suppression of the final vowel of the base, *ỵ* in this case—and in the neuter *e* retaining the vowel and dropping the *ỵ*. These bases, therefore, correspond to the Indian in य *ya*, the Greek and Latin in

---

the Carniolan, before all inflections beginning with *m* in the three numbers, as *posla-m*, "through the domestic," *posla-ma* "the two domestics." This word appears to be identical with पुत्र *putra*, "son," Persian *pisar* "son," "boy," "young man," and to owe its meaning to familiar address.

ιο, *iu* (*ἅγιο-ς*, *ἅγιο-ν*, *sociu-s*, *prœliu-m*); that is to say, *serdze* (nominative and accusative neuter), "heart," corresponds to the Sanskṛit हृदयम् *hṛidaya-m*, which is likewise neuter. The feminines, again, afford a practical proof of the justice of this theory, for the Sclavonic bases in *ỵa* correspond to the Sanskṛit feminine bases in या *yâ* Greek *ια*, Latin *ia*); and this form, in the uninflected nominative, stands opposed to the masculine termination *y* and neuter *e*, as *sinỵa*, "*cærulea*," to *sinỵ*, "*cæruleus*," and *sine*, "*cæruleum*."

[G. Ed. p. 344.] When an *i* or other vowel precedes the last *ỵ* but one of the base, the *ỵ* in the nominative, and accusative masculine is changed into the vowel *ĭ*; as, *nỵetiĭ*, "*nepos ex sorore*" (Dobrowsky, p. 282). The corresponding feminine form is *iỵa*, and the neuter *ỵe*, the *ỵ* of which has arisen from *ị* of the form *iỵe*, which is to be supposed the original, after dropping the last *ỵ* but one. To the Sanskṛit सव्यस् *savya-s*, सव्या *savyâ*, सव्यम् *savya-m* (*sinister*, *a*, *um*), correspond thus *shûi*, *shûỵa*, *shûe* (compare Dobrowsky, p. 285).

259. The Old Sclavonic masculine and neuter bases in *ỵo*,* with their feminines in *ỵa*, are, according to their origin, of four kinds :—1. Those in which, as in *SHŪỴO*=सव्य *savya*, both the semi-vowel and the vowel following, from the earliest period of the language, belong to the base of the word; and this case is perhaps the most rare. 2. Such as originally end in *i*, to which an unorganic *o* has been added; as, in the Lithuanian, the bases in *i*, in many cases, change into the declension in *ia* (*ie*) (§. 193. and p. 174, Note *). To this class belongs *MORỴO*, nom. *more*, "the sea," the *e* of which therefore differs widely from

---

* Where I fix the theme, I leave the euphonic law contained in §. 255. (*n.*) unregarded, and I give *SERDZỴO* as the theme of *serdze* ("heart," nom. acc.), although the latter is no other than the theme modified according to that euphonic law, *i.e.* without inflection, as in the Sanskṛit *vâch* is laid down as the theme, although *ch* cannot stand at the end of a word, but passes into *k*, as in the nominative *vâk*, which is properly identical with the theme.

the *mare* in Latin, corrupted from *mari;* so that the Sclavonic *ỵ*, which again makes its appearance in the genitive *morỵa*, dative *morỵû*, corresponds to the Latin *e* spoken of. The Latin word must, however, in order to be classed with the Sclavonic, be pronounced in the nominative *mariu-m*. Neuter bases in *i*, without an unorganic augment, are entirely wanting in the Sclavonic. [G. Ed. p. 345.] Among the masculines of this class of words *chervỵ*, "a worm" (theme *CHERVỴO*), answers to the Sanskṛit कृमि *kṛimi* and the Latin *VERMI*, Old High German, *WURMI;* and *ζỵatỵ* (*ζỴATỴO*), "*gener*," to the Sanskṛit जाति *jâti*, feminine, "*familia*," "*genus*," from जन् *jan*, "to be born."*

The third kind of bases in *ỵo* is that where the unorganic *ỵ* precedes a final *o*, according to the euphonic disposition mentioned in §. 255. (*n.*). So *gûsỵ* (*GŪSỴO*) corresponds to the Indian हंस *hańsa*, "goose" (§. 255. *g.*). In the fourth place there exist among bases in *ỵo* the words in which the *ỵ* as well as the following vowel is an unorganic addition. Thus †nouns of agency in *TARỴO* correspond to the Sanskṛit in तर् *tar* (तृ *tṛi*, in the strong cases तार् *târ*,) to the Latin in *tôr*, and to the Greek in τηρ, τωρ; hence the nominatives *my-tarỵ*, *schi-tàrỵ*, and *ζlatarỵ* (Dobrowsky, p. 295), and, with *ỵ* for *a*, *pas-tyrỵ*, "shepherd." Of this kind, also, are the nouns of agency in *TELỴO*, the *l* of which is clearly an interchange with *r* (§. 20.), so that this suffix also conforms itself to the Sanskṛit तर् *tar;* hence the nominatives *blago-dỵetelỵ*, "*beneficus*," *pỵe-telỵ*, "a cock," from the root *pỵe*, "to sing," *schatelỵ*, "*messor*," *spas-i-telỵ*, "*salvator*."‡

---

* *ζ* frequently answers to the Sanskṛit ज् *j*, and for example ज्ञा *jnâ*, "to know," is in the Sclavonic *ζna* (infinitive *ζnati*).

† But see p. 879. Note §. 647.

‡ As these words stand in analogy with the infinitive in *ti*, in so far that their suffix begins with a like consonant, Dobrowsky (pp. 292, 293) derives them from the infinitive, and allows them simply *elỵ* as suffix (as also simple *arỵ* for *tarỵ*), as it has been the custom to derive also, in the Latin, *tor* and *turus* from the supine. However, it is certain the

260. To the Sanskrit feminine bases in आ â correspond as has been already remarked, Old Sclavonic in *a*. To [G. Ed. p. 346.] this class of words, however, belong also some masculines, particularly proper names, which are then declined entirely as feminines, as in Latin *nauta*, *cœlicola* ,&c. (§. 116.), on which we will not here dwell further. Among the bases in *i* there are, in Old Sclavonic, no neuters, and only a very small number of masculines — as in Lithuanian — which Dobrowsky, p. 469, represents as anomalous, as though they were only irregulars of his second declension masculine: they are, however, in reality, foreign to it, for this very reason, that they end their theme with *i*, but the former with *ỵo*, and in part with *yỵ*, (§. 263.). It is only in the nominative and accusative singular that these three classes of words, from various reasons, agree; and, *gostỵ*, "guest," from *GOSTI** (Gothic *GASTI*, Latin *ḤOSTI*) agrees with *knyaʓỵ*, "prince," from *KNỴAʓỴO*, and *vrachỵ*, "*medicus*," from *VRACHỴY*. The masculine bases originally ending with *n*—there are but a few of them—form most of their cases from a base augmented by *i*; *KAMEN*, "stone" (Sanskrit अश्मन् *aśman*), is extended to *KAMENI*, and then follows *GOSTI*.

261. To the Sanskrit feminine bases in इ *i* correspond numerous Old Sclavonic bases of a similar termination (Dobrowsky, decl. fem. IV.); that is to say, the Sclavonic agrees with the Sanskrit in the formation of feminine ab-

---

the suffixes *TOR*, *TURU* and the Sclavonic *TARỴO*, *TELỴO*, used to borrow their *t* not at first from another syllable of formation so commencing. They form primitive words from the roots themselves, and not derivatives from other words.

* Thus, also, *PŪTI*, "a way" (Sanskrit पथिन् *pathin*), and *LỴŪDI*, pl. *num*, nom. *lỵûdỵ-e*, "people," Gothic *LAUDI*, nom. *lauths*, "a person," the *au* of which, according to §.255. (*f*.), is represented by *û* (ȣ), and, according to §.255. (*m*.), has gained a prefixed *ỵ*. *GOSPODI*, "a master" (comp. पति *pati*, Lithuan. *PATI* and Gothic *FADI*) is in fact irregular, as it passes into several kinds of theme in its declension.

stracts in *TI*, as *PA-MỴA-TI*, "memory," nom. *pamyaty*, from the root *MAN*, as in Sanskṛit मति *mati* (for *manti*), "spirit," "meaning," from मन् *man*, "to think"* (compare *memini*). These words weaken, indeed, in [G. Ed. p. 347.] the nominative and accusative, their *i* to *yer*, but in no case overstep their original base by an unorganic addition; and hence they must not, on any account, be looked upon as of the same base with the majority of masculines terminating similarly in the nominative and accusative singular. But Dobrowsky's third feminine declension is of a mixed nature (*zerkovy*, "a church"): in this we recognise some words which have, by Guna, changed a Sanskṛit final ऊ *û* to *ov*; and from this form several cases, as from a base ending with a consonant—*e.g.* *zerkv-e*, genitive singular and nominative plural—but so that the *o* is suppressed before vowel terminations. In some cases the theme extends itself by an unorganic *i*, in others by *a*; and also before these extensions of the base the *o* of the syllable *ov* is suppressed†; *e.g.* *zerkviy-û*, "*per ecclesiam*," *zerkvi*, "*ecclesia*," *zerkviĭ*, "*ecclesiarum*," *zerkva-m*, "*ecclesiis*," *zerkva-ch*, "*in ecclesiis*," *zerkva-mi*, "*per ecclesias*." The dative locative *zerkvi* is doubtful, as this case could have no other sound than *zerkvi*, whether it come from *ZERKOV* or from *ZERKVI*.

---

* Dobrowsky (p. 355) imputes, in my opinion wrongly, the *n* of *pomyanû*, "I remember," and some similar bases, to derivation, instead of supposing that the radical *n* is suppressed before *t*, in analogy with the Sanskṛit, and as, in Greek, τάσις from TAN, Sanskṛit ततिस् *tati-s*, "a line" (as extended), for तन्तिस् *tanti-s*.

† The example given by Dobrowsky, *zerkovy*, "a church," nevertheless does not apply to monosyllables, as *krovy*, "blood" (Sanskṛit क्रव्य *kravya*, neuter, "flesh"), nor to those polysyllables in which two consonants precede the syllable *ov*; for *yatrvach* and *krvach* would be equally impracticable (comp. Gretsch by Reiff, p. 163). *Brovy*, "eyebrow," also appears to form all its cases from a theme *BROVI*, an extension of the Sanskṛit भ्रू *bhrû*, feminine, by the addition of *i*, with a Guna of the ऊ *û*. The nominative plural is hence *brovi* (Dobrowsky, p. 115), not *brov-e*.

Some words of this class have, in the nominative, *y*, and [G. Ed. p. 348.] thus *svekry* agrees with श्वश्रूस् *śwaśrû-s*, "*socrus*" (§. 255. *c.*); others have, at will, *ovy̧* or *vi*, with *o* suppressed; hence *zerkovy̧* or *zerkvi*.

262. Among bases in *u* (Greek *υ*) of the cognate languages, only masculines have maintained themselves in the Old Sclavonic. They, like the bases in *o*, suppress their final vowel in the nominative and accusative, but in the remaining cases this letter shews itself either with Guna changed to *ov* or *ŭ* (§. 255. *f.*), or without Guna, as *o* (§. 255. *c.*); and in the latter form it appears also in the beginning of compound words as a naked theme. Hence it is more probable, that anciently for *syn*, "*filius*," "*filium*," stood *syno* rather than *syny* (§. 255. *c.*).* With this similar conformation of theme of the old bases in *a* and *u*, it is not surprising that two kinds of bases, which in their origin are widely different, run very much into one another in the Sclavonic declension; and that, in the more modern dialects, these two declensions, which were originally so strictly separate, have fallen almost entirely into one.

263. As in the *o* bases which have arisen from अ *a*, a *y̧* preceding introduces a difference of declension, which we, in §. 258., have represented as purely euphonic, the same phenomenon makes its appearance also in the *y* bases, by means of which their Guna form is articulated *ev* (for *y̧ev*) instead

---

* We term this class of words, nevertheless, bases in *y*; for although their final letter never occurs as *y*, still, according to §. 225. (*c.*), *y* is the most legitimate, even if it be the most rare, representative of the Sanskṛit उ *u*. But should it be wished to call them bases in *o*, they would not be distinguished from the order of words, which, according to §. 257., bear this name with more right. The term *u* bases would be appropriate only so far as here, under the *u*, might be understood, not the Old Sclavonic ȣ (etymologically = ओ *ô*), but the Sanskṛit उ *u* or the Latin *u* of the fourth declension, which, in the Old Sclavonic, has no real existence.

of *ov*.* If, however, with Dobrowsky, we di- [G. Ed. p. 349.] vide the Old Sclavonic masculines—with the exception of the bases in *i*, §. 260.—into two declensions, and in doing this desire, as is natural, to ground the division on the final letters of the bases, we must place *knỵaʒỵ*, "prince" (nominative) of Dobrowsky's second declension in the first, and by the side of *rab*, "a servant": on the other hand, the words *syn*, "son," and *dom*, "a house," of Dobrowsky's first masculine declension must be transferred to the second declension as mutilated *y* forms. Of the paradigma here given by Dobrowsky, *vrachỵ*, "*medicus*," adheres most strictly to the true *y* declension, and, according to §. 255. (*n.*), opposes *ev* to the *ov* of *SYNY*. On the other hand, words inflected like *zarỵ*, "a king" (nominative), clearly form the nominative and genitive plural from bases in *i*; hence *zarỵ-e*, "kings," *zariĭ*, "of kings," from *ZARI*; as *gostỵ-e*, "*hospites*," and *gostiĭ*, "*hospitum*," from *GOSTI*. In the dative plural and instrumental singular the form *zare-m* is doubtful: in this and other words, also, of obscure origin, it remains uncertain whether the more contracted theme in *i*, or the more extended in *ỵy*, is the older; but it is certain that several old *i* bases have migrated into this declension by an unorganic addition; for instance, *ognỵ*, "fire" (nom.), dative *ognev-i*, from *OGNỴY*, agrees with the Sanskṛit अग्नि *agni*, Latin *IGNI*, Lithuanian *UGNI*.† It [G. Ed. p. 350.]

---

* Without Guna, the final of the base is pronounced *e* for *ye* from *yo* (§. 255. *n.*); and hence, in the cases without Guna the *ỵy* bases are just as little to be distinguished in their inflection from the *yo* bases, as, in the instrumental singular, *syno-m* (from the theme *SYNY*) from *rabo-m* (theme *RABO*). In the beginning of compound words, also, the *ỵy* bases end like those in *yo*, with *e* for *ye*.

† As regards words inflected like *mravĭĭ*, the only proof which could bring them under the head of the *y* bases is the vocative sing. *mruviỵû*: that they, however, although they have borrowed this case from the *y* declension, originally belong to the *o* declension, is proved by their feminine in *iỵa* and neuters in *iỵe* or *ỵe* (Dobrowsky, p. 282).

deserves here to be further remarked, that in the more modern dialects of the Sclavonic stock, the two masculine declensions here spoken of have been transfused almost entirely into one, which has taken several cases regularly from the old *u* declension, in which, however, from the point of view of the more recent dialects, *e.g.* in the genitive plural of the Polish and Carniolan, *ov, ow,* form an exception as a case termination. In the Old Sclavonic, also, *rab* (theme *RABO*), "a servant," may optionally form several cases from a theme *RABY* (for *rabŭ*); and for *rab,* "*servorum,*" we may also have *rabov:* and in the nominative plural of this class of words we find also *ov-e,* according to the analogy of *synov-e.* On the other hand, the adjective masculine *o* bases (the indefinites) of the *y* declension have admitted no irregular trespassings any more than the pronouns.

264. Bases ending in a consonant are, under the limitation of §. 260., entirely foreign to the masculine: on the other hand, there are neuter bases in *en, es,* and *at* (*ỵat*), which are important for the system of declension, because the case suffix, commencing with a vowel, divides itself so much the more distinctly from the base ending with a consonant. The bases in *en* correspond to the Sanskṛit in अन् *an,* and have preserved, too, in the uninflected nominative, accusative, and vocative, the old and more powerful *a,* but with the euphonic prefix of a *y* (see §. 255. *n.*), and with the suppression of *n* of the base (see §. 139.). All of them have an *m* before the termination *en*; so that *men* is to be considered as the full formative suffix of the word, which answers to the Sanskṛit मन् *man*—*e.g.* in कर्मन् *karman* neut., "deed"—and to the Latin *men;* that is to say, *SỴEMEN* (nominative *sỵemỵa,* "seed," from the base *sỵe*) answers to the Latin *se-men;* and *imen,* "a name," is a mutilation of नामन् *nâman,* "*nomen.*" The bases in *es* answer to the Sanskṛit neuter bases in *as,* as *nebes,*

"heaven," Sanskṛit नभस् *nabhas*. In the [G. Ed. p. 351.] nominative, accusative, and vocative, they relinquish the concluding *s* (according to §. 255. *l.*), and afterwards strengthen the *e* to *o* (§. 255. *a.*). We cannot, therefore, any longer compare the *o* of *nebo* with the Sanskṛit-Zendian *o*, which has arisen out of $a+u$. As in this abbreviation of *es* to *o* the neuter *es* bases in the cases mentioned become similar to the *o* bases, it is then—on account of the influence of these cases, and because the nominative principally gives the tone in the declension, and shews in the oblique cases as inflection that which is in itself deficient,—it is then, we say, not surprising, if the original *o* bases at times admit an *es* in the oblique cases, particularly when we consider the original great extension of these neuter bases terminating in *s* (compare §. 241.), which induces the conjecture, that many words, now declined as *o* bases, were originally domiciled in the bases in *es*. On the other hand, Dobrowsky proves that there is no admixture of *es* in the thoroughly legitimate adjective *o* bases. It is also clear, from §. 255. (*l.*), that the bases in *yat** in the uninflected cases must lay aside the *t*, and follow *σῶμα*, not महत् *mahat* ("*magnum*") and *caput*.

265. Of the class of words in *r* mentioned in §. 144. two feminine words have remained in the Old Sclavonic which derive most of their cases from the genuine *r* bases, but in others increase the original base by an unorganic *i*, or also by *ya* (compare the Lithuanian in §. 144.): in the nominative singular, however, in accordance with the Sanskṛit and Lithuanian, they suppress the *r*. These are, *mati*, "mother," and *dshchi*, "daughter"; in the latter only occurs the increase of the base by *ya* (in the nominative accusative and dative plural); the declension of the former springs [G. Ed. p. 352.]

---

* They are all derivatives from names of animals, and denote the young of the animal mentioned.

partly from *MATER*, *e.g.* *mater-e*, "*matris*," and *matres* (μᾰτέρ-ες), partly from *MATERI*, *e.g.* *materỵ*, "*matrem*."

266. [*]In order now to pass over to the formation of cases, the nominative and accusative have lost the case-signs *s* and *m*, with the exception of the bases in *a*, which present in the diphthong *û* (ȣ), a contraction of the vocalized nasal with the final vowel of the base shortened to *o*, (see §. 255. *g.*); hence *vodû*, "*aquam*," from *vodo-ŭ*. The instrumental has, in the feminine, and the pronouns which have no gender preserved the genuine Sanskṛit inflection; but it is to be remarked of the feminine bases in *i* that they change this vowel before the termination *û*, (for *û*, see §. 255. *h.*), not into simple *y*, but into *iỵ*; so that in this respect the Old Sclavonic agrees more closely with the Pâli, which, in the corresponding class of words, changes the final *i* before all the vowel endings into *iy*, than with the Sanskṛit. Hence, let *kostiỵ-û*, from *KOSTI*, "bones," be compared with the Pâli पीतिया *pîtiy-â* (from *pîti*, "joy"), for the Sanskṛit प्रीत्या *prîty-â*. Masculines and neuters have *m*[†] for their instrumental ending; and this is, I have no doubt, an abbreviation of the Lithuanian *mi*, and comes thereore from *bi* (§. 215.).

267. The dative has, in the singular, a common ending with the locative, and, in fact, the Old Sanskṛit *i* (§. 195.); hence, *imen-i*, "*in nomine*," and "*nomini*"; *synov-i*, "*filio*," *brachev-i*, "*medico*," from *SỴNY* and *BRACHỴY* (§. 263.), with Guna.[‡] If the case-sign is suppressed, the preceding *ov* [G. Ed. p. 353.] becomes *û*, and *ev* (from *yov*) becomes *yû*; hence, also, *synû*, "*filio*," with *synov-i*, and *zarỵû*, "*regi*," with

---

[*] Cf. §. 783¹.

[†] For *m*, according to Dobrowsky, we should read мъ *mỵ*.

[‡] Hence I am now disposed, contrary to §. 177., to assume for the Lithuanian a common origin for the two cases, although in their received condition they are externally separated from one another, as is the case in Old Sclavonic, also, in several classes of words.

the *y* bases, but prefer, however, the abbreviated form *ŭ*; hence *rabŭ*, from *RABO*, more rarely *rabov-i*. The *o* bases of the adjectives, and of these there are, in the masculine and neuter, only *o* bases, and those of neuter substantives have alone the uninflected form in *ŭ*; hence, *e.g.* *blagŭ*, "*bono*," masc. neut.; *sinyŭ*, "*cæruleo*," masc. neut.: *slovŭ*, "*verbo*," *moryŭ*, "*mari*": not *blagov-i*, *sinev-i*, *slovov-i*, *morev-i*. In masculine names of inanimate things this uninflected form in *ŭ* extends itself also to the genitive and locative; hence *domŭ*, "of the house," "to" and "in the house": but in the dative is also found *domov-i*, and in the locative *domye*.* The pronouns of the 3d person masculine and neuter—with exception of the reflexive—have in the dative, in like manner, the uninflected *ŭ*; for the form *mŭ* in *to-mŭ*, "to this," is clearly from the Sanskṛit appended pronoun स्म *sma* (§. 165. &c.), which has extended itself in the cognate European languages so much, and under such different forms, and this, in the Old Sclavonic, would necessarily give the base *SMO*, from which, after dropping the *s*, would come the dative *mŭ*, as *rabŭ* from *RABO*.

268. While the *o* bases, as has been shewn above, have borrowed their dative from the *y* declension, the *y* bases appear, in the locative, to have intruded on the *o* class; for *synye* answers to *rabye*, from *RABO* from *RABA* (§. 255. *a.*); but the *ye* of *rabye* is. according to §. 255. (*e*), clearly from the Sanskṛit ए *ê* of वृके *vṛikê* from वृक *vṛika*, and answers to the Lithuanian *wilkė* from [G. Ed. p. 354.] *WILKA* (§. 197.). As, however, in Lithuanian, from *SUNU* comes *sunu-ye*, so may also the Old Sclavonic *synye* require

---

* Masculine names of inanimate things all follow the declension of *dom* (theme *DOMY*), although very few among them, according to their origin, fall into the class of the old उ *u*, *i.e.* of the Latin fourth declension, but for the most part correspond to Sanskṛit bases in अ *a*.

to be divided into *syn'-ỵe:* and this is rendered the more probable, as the feminine *a* bases, also, have in the locative *ỵe* for *a-ỵe;* hence *vod'-ỵe,* "*in aqua,*" from *VODA,* answers to the Lithuanian *ranko-ỵe* (for *ranka-ỵe*) from *ranka.** In bases in *i,* masculine and feminine, it might appear doubtful whether *i,* with which they end in the dative and locative—*e. g. pûti,* "in the way," *kosti,* "in the bone"—is to be ascribed to the theme or to the inflection: as, however, in the genitive, (to which belongs an *i,* though not through any inflection), they have just the same sound, and otherwise never entirely give up the *i* of the base, except in the instrumental plural, it is more natural to consider the forms *pûti, kosti,* uninflected, just like *domû,* "in the house." We may also look upon the *i* in the dative and locative of those bases, which have *ỵ* as the last letter but one, as nothing else than the vocalization of this *ỵ*; the *i,* therefore, of *knyaζi, mori, brachi, voli,* represents nothing else than the *ỵ* of the masculine bases *KNỴAζỴO, VRACHỴY,* and of the neuter *MORỴO,* and feminine *VOLỴO.*

269. In the genitive the terminations *as, os, is,* which in the cognate languages, are joined to bases ending with a consonant, must, according to §. 255. (*l.*), drop the *s,* but the vowel appears as *e* in all the bases ending with a consonant (§§. 260. 264.): hence *imen-e,* "of the name,"

[G. Ed. p. 355.]

---

* It must be allowed that here occurs the very weighty objection, that the feminine form *rankoỵe* in the Lithuanian, and *vodỵe* in the Sclavonic, might stand in connection with the Sanskṛit आयाम् *âyâm* in जिह्वायाम् *jihwây-âm* (§. 202.); so that, after dropping the *m,* as in the Zend (§. 202.), the preceding vowel, which in the Zend is already short, would, through the euphonic influence of the *ỵ,* become *e.* As the bases in *i* in the Lithuanian, down to a few exceptions, are feminine, so might also *awiỵe* from *awi-s,* "a sheep," be divided into *awiỵ-e,* and compared with मत्याम् *maty-âm,* from *mati* or भियाम् *bhiy-âm* from *bhî* (comp. in §. 266. *kostiỵ-û,* for *kostỵ-û,* from *KOSTI*).

answers to नाम्नस् *nâmn-as, nomin-is; nebes-e,* "of the heaven," to नभसस् *nabhas-as, νέφε(σ)-ος; mater-e* to *matr-is, μητρός.* The pronominal forms also follow this analogy: *men-e,* "*mei,*" *teb-e,* "*tui,*" *seb-e,* "*sui,*" because, in the oblique singular cases, *MEN, TEB, SEB* are their themes. We recognise the fuller Sanskṛit genitive ending स्य *sya* in the pronominal genitive termination *go,* as *to-go* = तस्य *ta-sya* (§. 188.). This comparison might alone be sufficient in place of all proof; but, over and above, is to be remarked the easily adopted hardening of the semi-vowel *y* to *g* (comp. p. 121 G. ed.), and in the Prâkṛit to ज् *j* (§. 19.); finally, let the high degree of improbability be considered, that the Sclavonic should have formed an entirely new genitive termination, foreign to all the cognate languages. Now, if the *g* of the termination *go* is taken for a hardening from *y* (य् *y*), then the Old Sclavonic has preserved exactly as much as the Greek of the termination *sya;* and *go* answers to the Greek *ιο,* and *to-go,* "*hujus,*" to the Greek *το-ῖο.* As, however, in Sclavonic, the sibilants are easily interchanged with gutturals (see §. 255. *m.*), one might also conjecture the *g* of *go* to be a corruption of the Sanskṛit *s* and the semi-vowel of स्य *sya,* which had been lost. This conjecture cannot entirely be put aside; but in any case, even in this supposition, the termination *go* remains connected with स्य *sya* and *ιο.* As, however, in the Old Sclavonic, *g* is elsewhere exchanged only with *ζ* and *sch* (Dobr. p. 41), but not with *s,* in my opinion the derivation of *g* from *y* (य् *y*) is to be preferred to that from *s.*

270. The substantive and adjective (indefinite) *o* bases, in disadvantageous comparison with the pronouns which hold fast the old form, have lost the genitive termination *go;* but for it, in compensation for the lost termination, they have retained the old *a* of the base, instead of, according to §. 255. (*a.*), weakening it to *o;* hence *raba,* "*servi,*" *nova* (= Sanskṛit *nava-sya*) "*novi.*" Now, although the *y* bases [G. Ed. p. 356.]

in the genitive end in *a*, the comparison of the form *syna*, "*filii*," with the Lithuanian and Gothic *sunaú-s*, *sunau-s*, and the Sanskrit *sûnô-s* (from *sûnau-s*), teaches that the *a* here is only a Guna element, but foreign to the proper base, as well as to the case-suffix, which, according to §. 255. (*b.*), must disappear.

271. The feminine bases in *a*, with the exception of those which have a penultimate *ỵ*, change that *a* in the genitive into *y*; hence *vody*, "*aquæ*," from *VODA*, but *volỵa*, "*voluntatis*," with unaltered base, from *VOLỴA*. I ascribe that *y*, as well as that in the nominative plural, to the euphonic influence of the *s*, which originally ends the form (see §. 255. *d.*): this, however, does not obtain if a *ỵ* precedes the *a*; hence *volỵa*, "*voluntatis*," is identical with the theme. On the other hand, the feminine pronominal bases in *a* have preserved a remarkable agreement with the Sanskrit pronominal declension; for if *ta*, "this" (at the same time the theme), forms *to-ỵa* in the genitive, I do not doubt of the identity of the ending *ỵa* with the Sanskrit *syâs* (§. 172.), as in the word तस्यास् *tasyâs*, of the same import, for the final *s* must, according to §. 255. (*l.*), give way; but the *a* of the Sclavonic *ỵa* directs us, according to §. 255. (*a.*), to an Indian आ *â*, just as the preceding *o* points to a short अ *a*. The irregularity, therefore, in the shortening of the Sclavonic termination lies only in the dropping of the sibilant before *ỵ*, as, in the Greek, *τοῖο*, from तस्य *ta-sya*, and in the *to-go*, for *to-(s)ỵo*, mentioned in §. 269.

272. In the vocative, which in the cognate languages is without any case-suffix (§. 204.), *o* is weakened to *e* (ε) and *a* to *o* (§. 255. *a.*); hence *nove* (from *NOVO*, "new"), for [G. Ed. p. 357.] Sanskrit नव *nava*, is identical with the Latin *nŏvĕ*, and answers to the Greek *νέ(ϝ)ε*: from *VODA*, "water," comes *vodo*; but from *VOLỴA*, according to §. 255. (*n.*), *vole* for *volỵo*: and so from *KNỴAÇỴO*, "prince," *knỵashe** for

---

* *ç* before *e* becomes *sh*.

knỵaζỵe. Bases in *ỵy* change their *y* by Guna to *û* (§. 255.*f.*), in analogy with §. 205.; hence *vrachỵû*—more commonly, with *y* suppressed, *vrachû*—"*medice!*" from *VRACHỴY.* On the other hand, *y* bases without *ỵ* for their penultimate letter commonly omit the Guna, and weaken their final vowel, like the *o* bases, to *e*; hence *syne*, "oh son!" more rarely *synû* (Dobr. p. 470), =Gothic *sunau*, Lithuanian *sunaù*, Sanskṛit *sûnô* from *sunau.*

DUAL.

273. By preserving a dual, the Old Sclavonic surpasses the Gothic, in which this number is lost in the noun: it exceeds, in the same, the Lithuanian in the more true retention of the terminations, and it is richer than the Greek by one case. The agreement with the Sanskṛit and Zend is not to be mistaken: let the comparison be made.

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.		OLD SCLAVONIC.
N. Acc. V. m.	*ubhâ* (*ambo* Vêdic),	*ubâ,*		*oba.*
f. n.	*ubhê,*	*ubê,*		*obỵe* (§. 255. *n.*).
I. D. Ab. m. f. n.	*ubhâ-bhyâm.*	*ubôi-bya,*	I. D.	*obỵe-ma* (§. 215.).*
G. L. m. f. n.	*ubhay-ôs,*	*ubôy-ô,*		*oboỵ-û.*†

---

* The *ỵe*, which precedes the termination *ma*, may be compared with the Sanskṛit *ê* in plural forms, as वृकेभ्यस् *vṛikêbhyas*: *ỵe-ma*, however, occurs in the Old Sclavonic only in *dvỵe-ma*, "*duobus*," "*per duos*," and some pronouns. The usual form of substantive *o*-bases before this ending is that with an unchanged *o*, as *sto-ma*, from *sto*, "a hundred"; and the final *a* of feminine substantives also remains unchanged, as *dỵeva-ma*, from *DỴEVA*, "a girl."

† The form *û*, for the Sanskṛit ending *ôs*, is, according to §. 255. (*f.*) and (*l.*), necessary: the Zend certainly approaches the Old Sclavonic in casting away the *s* voluntarily. The *oỵ*, which precedes the termination *û*, clearly corresponds to the Sanskṛit अय् *ay* (see §. 225.) and the Zend

[G. Ed. p. 358.] The Sanskṛit *ubhê*, as neuter, comes, according to §. 212., from the theme *ubha*, in union with the case-suffix *î*; and the feminine *ubhê* is an abbreviation of *ubhay-âu*, and is therefore without a case termination (§. 212.). The Old Sclavonic, which runs parallel to the Sanskṛit in both genders, and, according to §. 255. (*l.*), opposes *ỵe* to the Indian ए *ê*, no longer recognises the origin of this *ỵe*, and regards it entirely as a case-suffix before which the final vowel of the theme appears to be suppressed. Therefore, also, neuter bases ending in a consonant make *ỵe* their termination, if the *imenỵe*, "two names," given by Dobrowsky, p. 513, actually occurs, and is not a theoretic formation. In feminines, however, the termination *ỵe* extends, exactly as in Sanskṛit, only to bases in *a* (for Sanskṛit *â*, §. 255. *a.*); but in such a manner, that those with *ỵ* as the last letter but one in the theme reject the termination *ỵe*, and vocalize the *ỵ* of the theme; hence *dỵevỵe*, "two girls," from *dỵeva*, but *steζi*, "two steps," from *STEζỴA*. The feminine bases in *i*, in the dual case under discussion, answer to the Sanskṛit and Lithuanian forms mentioned at §§. 210. 211., as *patî*, "two sirs," from पति *pati*; [G. Ed. p. 359.] *awì*, "two sheep," from *AWI;* only that, according to §. 255. *b.*), the *i* in the Sclavonic is not lengthened; as *dlani* from *DLANI* (nominative singular

---

Zend *ôy* or *ay* (see p. 277); but that occurs only in *dvoỵ-û*=Sanskṛit *dway-ôs*, "of two," "in two" m. f. n., and in *toỵ-û*=Sanskṛit *tay-ôs*, "of these two," m. f. n. The genitives and locatives of the two first persons also rest on this principle, only retaining the older *a*—*nayû*, *vâỵû*. For the rest, however, the final vowel of the theme is rejected before the termination *û*, as *st'-û* (Sanskṛit *shatay-ôs*) from *STO*, "a hundred," *dỵev-û* from *DỴEVA*, "a girl"; and thus occurs, also, together with *dvoỵû*, the syncopated form *dvû*. Although the Lithuanian generally does not drop the final *s*, still the *û* mentioned in §. 225. may be identical with the Sclavonic *û*; as in the Zend, also, in this termination the *s* is often dropped.

dlanỵ), "*vola manus.*" On the other hand, the masculine *y* bases do not follow this principle, but suppress the final vowel before the case-suffix *a*; hence *syn'-a*, "two sons," from *SYNY.*

PLURAL.

274. In the plural, the masculine nominative termination *e* (ε) for the most part answers to the Greek ες, and, according to a universal rule of sounds, omits the *s* (§. 255. *l.*); hence *synov-e*, "the sons," सूनवस् *sûnav-as:* compare *βότρυ-ες*, *kamen-e*, "the stones," for अश्मानस् *aśṃân-as* (§. 21.); compare *δαίμον-ες*, *gostỵ-e*, "guests" (theme *GOSTI*), for the Gothic *gastei-s*, and Greek forms like *πόσι-ες*. The bases in *o* take, as in Lithuanian do the corresponding bases in *a*, *i* as their termination (see §. 228.), but before this reject the *o* of the base; hence *rab'-i*, "servants," for *rabo-i* (comp. λύκο-ι), as in Latin *lup-ī* for *lupo-i.* Neuters have *a* for their ending, like the cognate dialects, with the exception of the Sanskṛit with *i* for *a*; nevertheless, *slova*, "*verba*," from *SLOVO*—as δῶρα from ΔΩΡΟ—answers to Vêdic forms like *vanấ*, "woods," from *vana;* and the same thing obtains which, §. 231. p. 267 G. ed., has been said of Gothic, Greek, and Latin, regarding the relation of the *a* of the termination to the *o* of the theme. As regards the bases ending in a consonant, let *imen-a*, "names," be compared with the Latin *nomin-a* and Gothic *namôn-a*; *nebes-a*, "the heavens," with *νεφε(σ)-α*; and *telỵat-a*, "calves," with Greek forms like *σώματ-α.* Feminines, with the exception of the class of words in *ov* mentioned at §. 261., have lost the nominative ending; hence *volỵa*, "*voluntates*," is the same as the theme and the nominative singular; and [G. Ed. p. 360.] from *KOSTI*, "bones" (Sanskṛit *asthi*, neuter) comes the nominative singular *kostỵ*, and the plural like the theme.

275. The accusative plural is, in feminine and neuter nouns, the same as the nominative, and therefore in the former

mostly without inflection, exactly as in the few masculine bases in *i*; hence *gosti* for the Gothic *gasti-ns*. Bases in *o*, without *y̦* preceding, like *RABO*, change this *o* into *y̦*, as *raby*, "*servos*"; at least I cannot believe that this *y* is to be looked upon as the case-suffix; and I pronounce it to be the euphonic alteration of the *o* of the base, through the influence of the consonant of the inflection which has been dropped (comp. §. 271.): as in Lithuanian, also, the corresponding class of words often changes the final vowel (*a*) of the base into *u*; hence *wilkù-s*, "*lupos*," answering to the Gothic *vulfa-ns* and Sanskrit *vṛikâ-n*. But if the Old Sclavonic bases in *y*, of animate creatures, form *owy* in the accusative plural, and thus *synovy*, "*filios*," answers to the Lithuanian *sunù-s* (from *SUNU*), this very Lithuanian form, as well as the Gothic and Sanskrit *sunu-ns*, सूनून् *sûnû-n*, prove that the Sclavonic form is unorganic, and formed from an augmented theme *SYNOVO*, according to the analogy of *raby*. Bases in *y̦y* in this case follow bases in *y̦o* (from *y̦a*, §. 255. *a.*), which, preserving the old *a* sound, give *y̦a*, as in the genitive singular (see §. 270.); hence *vrachy̦a*, "*medicos*," like *knyaζy̦a*, "*principes*": but forms, also, like *doschdevy*, analogous with *synovy*, occur, following the euphonic rule, §. 255. (*n.*).

276. The view here given is the more incontrovertible, as in the dative, also, *synovo-m*, "*filiis*" (compare *rabo-m*), is clearly formed from a theme *SYNOVO*, increased by *o*, corresponding to the Lithuanian *sunu-ms*. This dative suffix *m*, for the Lithuanian *ms* (from *mus*, §. 215.), according [G. Ed. p. 361.] to §. 255. (*l.*), extends itself over all classes of words, and appears to be attached by a conjunctive vowel *e* to bases terminating with a consonant; but, in fact, it is to be considered that these, in the cases mentioned as also in the locative (see §. 279.), pass over into the *i* declension, as a final *i*, before the signs of case *m* and *ch*, becomes *e*: and a similar metaplasm occurs in the Lithuanian, and indeed, to a

much greater extent (§. 125. *sub finem*, comp. §. 126.); hence *imene-m*, *imene-ch*, from *IMENI* from *IMEN*, "names," as *koste-m*, *koste-ch*, from *KOSTI*, "bones."

277. Less general is the instrumental ending *mi*, answering, subject to the loss required by §. 255. (*l.*), to the Lithuanian *mis*, Sanskṛit *bhis*, and Zend *bîs*. This termination *mi* is, however, in masculine and neuter nouns for the most part lost (comp. Dobr. pp. 473 and 477); and is preserved principally, and indeed without exception, in feminines, as well as in a few masculine *i* bases: a final *i* of the base is, however, suppressed before the termination *mi*. Let *kost'-mi* be compared with अस्थिभिस् *asthi-bhis*, from अस्थि *asthi*, "bone"; *vdova-mi* with विधवाभिस् *vidhavâ-bhis*, from विधवा *vidhavâ*, "a widow." The instrumentals *raby*, *synovy*, are, like the accusatives of similar sound, uninflected (§. 275.); the *i* of *kny̧aζi*, *vrachi*, is the vocalization of the *y̧* of the bases *KY̧NAζY̧O*, *VRACHY̧Y*, after the loss of the final vowel; and the *y̧* of neuters terminating in a consonant, like *imeny* "*per nomina*," is to be explained by a transition into the *o* declension, and is therefore analogous to *raby*, *slavy*, similarly to the *o* of the Greek dual forms like δαιμόνοιν (p. 318 G. ed. Rem. 2.).

278. Dobrowsky (p. 461) represents *ov*, *y̧*, *iĭ*, *ev*, *en*, *y̧at*, and *es*, as plural genitive terminations; but in reality the suffix of this case has entirely disappeared, and in bases in *o*, *a*, and *y*, has also carried away those final vowels with it, while bases in *i* double that vowel; hence *rab*, [G. Ed. p. 362.] "*servorum*," from *RABO*; *vod*, "*aquarum*," from *VODA*; *syn*, "*filiorum*," from *SYNY*; *kostiĭ*, "*ossium*," from *KOSTI*; *imen*, "*nominum*," from *IMEN*; *nebes*, "*cœlorum*," from *NEBES*. The *n* and *s* of *imen*, *nebes*, would, without the former protection of a following termination have been dropped, as in Sclavonic we have only a second generation of final consonants; while the former, with the exception of a few monosyllabic forms, has, according to §. 255. (*l.*), disappeared.

279. The termination of the locative plural is *ch* throughout all classes of words, and has been already, at §. 255. (*m.*) recognised as identical with the Indian सु *su*, and therefore, also, with the Greek *σι*: compare, also, the Zend 𐬓𐬀 *kha*, for the Sanskṛit *swa*, in §. 35. Before this *kh*, *o* passes into *ỵe*, exactly as the corresponding Sanskṛit अ *a* into ए *ê* (see §. 255. *e.*); hence *rabỵe-ch*, "*in servis*," answers to वृकेषु *vṛikê-shu*, "*in lupis*." Bases in *ỵo*—and those in *ỵỵ* follow their analogy—suppress, however, before this *ỵe*, their preceding *ỵ*, as in similar cases; hence *knyaζỵe-ch*, "*in principibus*," not *knyaζỵỵ-ch* from *KNỴAζỴO*. A final *a* remains unchanged; hence *vdova-ch*, "*in viduis*," answers to the Sanskṛit *vidhavâ-su*. For bases in *i*, and consonants, see §. 276.

280. For an easier survey of the results obtained for the Old Sclavonic case-formation, we give here, in order to bring under one point of view all the kinds of theme existing in Old Sclavonic, and to render their comparison with one another easy, the complete declension of the bases: *RABO*, m. "a servant," *KNỴAζỴO*, m. "a prince," *SLOVO*, n. "a word," *MORỴO*, n. "a sea" (Dobr. p. 476, §. 11.), *VODA*, f. "water," *VOLỴA*, f. "will," *GOSTI*, m. "a guest," *KOSTI*, f. "a bone," *SYNY*, m. "a son," *DOMY*, m. "a house," *VRACHỴY*, m. "a physician," *KAMEN*, m. [G. Ed. p. 363.] "a stone," *IMEN*, n. "a name," *MATER*, f. "a mother," *NEBES*, n. "heaven," *TELỴAT*, n. "a calf."* In

---

* The above examples are arranged according to their final letters, with the observation, however, that *o* represents an original short *a*, and hence precedes the *a* for Sanskṛit *â* (§. 225. *a.*). All bases in *t* have a *ỵ* before the preceding *a*; this semi-vowel is, however, readily suppressed after sibilants; hence *ovcha* for *ovchya*, Dobr. p. 475; and hence, also, from *lizỵo* come (nom. *lize*) the genitive, dative, and nominative accusative plural *liza*, *lizû*, for *lizỵa*, *lizỵû*. If in bases in *ỵo*, m. n., and in feminines in *ỵa*, an *i* precedes the semi-vowel, this involves some apparent variations

those forms of the following table in which a part of the word is not separated from the rest, thereby shewing itself to be the inflection, we recognise no inflection at all, *i.e.* no case-suffix; but we see therein only the bare base of the word, either complete or abbreviated; or also a modification of the base, through the alteration of the final letter, occasioned by the termination which has been dropped (compare §. 271.). In some cases which we present in the notes, base and termination have, however, been contracted into one letter, by which a division is rendered impossible. With respect to the dual, which cannot be proved to belong to all the words here given as specimens, we refer to §. 273.

---

variations in the declension, which require no particular explanation here (see, in Dobr. *mraviĭ*, m. p. 468; *ladiỵa*, f. p. 478; and *ûchenỵe*, n. p. 474. With regard to *zarỵ*, "a king," see §. 263).

[G. Ed. p. 364.]

SINGULAR.

THEME.	NOM.	ACCUS.	INSTR.	DATIVE.	GEN.	LOC.	VOC.
RABO, m.[1]	*rab'*,	*rab'*,	*rabo-my*,	*rabû*,[18]	*raba*,[21]	*rabỵe*,[25]	*rabe.*
KNỴAζỴO. m.[2]	*knỵaζỵ'*,	*knỵaζỵ'*,	*knỵaζe-my*,	*knỵaζỵû*,	*knỵaζỵa*,[21]	*knỵaζi*,	*knỵasche.*
SLOVO, n.[3]	*slovo*,	*slovo*,	*slovo-my*,	*slovû*,	*slova*,[21]	*slovỵe*,[25]	....
MORỴO, n.[2]	*more*,	*more*,	*more-my*,	*morỵû*,	*morỵa*,[21]	*mori*,	....
VODA, f.[4]	*voda*,	*vodû*,[15]	*vodoỵ-û*,[16]	*vod'-ỵe*,[19]	*vody*,[22]	*vod'-ỵe*,[25]	*vodo.*
VOLỴA, f.[4]	*volỵa*,	*volỵû*,[15]	*voleỵ-û*,[16]	*voli*,	*volỵa*,	*voli*,	*vole.*
GOSTI, m.[5]	*gostỵ*,	*gostỵ*,	*goste-my*,[17]	*gosti*,[20]	*gosti*,	*gosti*,[20]	*gosti ?*
KOSTI, f.[5]	*kostỵ*,	*kostỵ*,	*kostiỵ-û*,[16]	*kosti*,[20]	*kosti*,	*kosti*,[20]	*kosti.*
SYNY, m.[6]	*syn'*,	*syn'*,	*syno-my*,[17]	*synov-i*,	*syna*,[21]	*synỵe*,[25]	*synû.*[26]
DOMY, m.[7]	*dom'*,	*dom'*,	*domo-my*,	*domov-i*,	*domû*,	*domû*,	*dome.*
VRACHỴY, m.[8]	*vrachỵ'*,	*vrachỵ'*,	*vrache-my*,	*vrachev-i*,	*vrachỵa*,[23]	*vrachi*,	*vrachỵû.*
KAMEN, m.[9]	*kamy'*,[14]	....	*kamene-my*,	*kamen-i*,	*kamen-e*,[24]	*kamen-i*,	....
IMEN, n.[10]	*imỵa*,	*imỵa*,	*imene-my*,	*imen-i*,	*imen-e*,[24]	*imen-i*,	....
MATER, f.[11]	*mati*,	....	....	*mater-i*,	*mater-e*,[24]	*mater-i*,	....
NEBES, n.[12]	*nebo*,	*nebo*,	*nebese-my*,	*nebes-i*,	*nebes-e*,[24]	*nebes-i*,	....
TELỴAT, n.[13]	*telỵa*,	*telỵa.*	*telỵate-my*,	*telỵat-i*,	*telỵat-e*,[24]	*telỵat-i*,	....

---

[1] Comp. p. 273, &c.
[2] See §§. 258. 259
[3] Comp. pp. 275, 276.
[4] Comp. p. 285.
[5] Comp. p. 286.
[6] Comp. p. 288.
[7] See p. 337, Note.
[8] See §. 263.

[9] Comp. p. 304. The cases wanting come from *KAMENI* (see §. 260.); whence, also, *kamene-m*, *kamene-ch* (§. 266.); and whence, also, might be derived the dative and locative *kamen-i*, which I prefer, however, deriving from the original theme, just as in *MATER*.

[10] Comp. §. 139.
[11] See §. 265. and comp. p. 305.
[12] Comp. p. 306. and §. 147.
[13] See §. 264.
[14] Dobr. p. 287.
[15] See §. 266.
[16] Comp. Sanskrit *jihway-â*, &c. See §. 266.
[17] Comp. Lith. *pati-mi*, *sunu-mi.*
[18] Or *rabovi*, §. 267.
[19] See §. 268.

[20] The *i* may also be ascribed to the mark of case, and the dropping of the final letter of the base may be assumed; but in the genitive of the same sound, the *i* clearly belongs to the theme.

[21] See §. 270.
[22] See §. 271.
[23] More commonly *vracha*, and in the vocative, *vrachû*. See p. 347, Note.
[24] See §. 269.
[25] See §. 268.
[26] Or *syne*.

PLURAL. [G. Ed. p. 365.]

NOM. VOC.[1]	ACCUS.[3]	INSTR.[5]	DATIVE.[6]	GEN.[7]	LOCATIVE.[8]
rab'-i,	*raby,*	*raby,*	*rabo-m,*	*rab',*	*rabỵe-ch.*
knỵaζi,	*knỵaζya,*	*knỵaζi,*	*knỵaζe-m,*	*knỵaζy',*	*knỵaζe-ch*
slova,	*slova,*	*slovy,*	*slovo-m,*	*slov',*	*slovỵe-ch,*
morỵa,	*morỵa,*	*mori,*	*more-m,*	*morỵ',*	*morỵe-ch.*
vody,[2]	*vody,*	*voda-mi,*	*voda-m,*	*vod',*	*voda-ch*
volỵa,	*volỵa,*	*volỵa-mi,*	*volỵa-m,*	*volỵ',*	*volỵa-ch.*
gostỵ-e,	*gosti,*	*gost'-mi,*	*goste-m,*	*gostiĭ,*	*goste-ch.*
kosti,	*kosti,*	*kost'-mi,*	*koste-m,*	*kostii,*	*koste-ch.*
synov-e,	*synovy,*[4]	*synovy,*[4]	*synovo-m,*[4]	*synov,*	*synovỵe-ch.*[4]
domov-e,	*domy,*	*domy,*	*domo-m,*	*domov,*	*dome-ch.*
vrachev e,	*vrachỵa,*	*vrachi,*	*vrache-m,*	*vrachev,*	*vrache-ch.*
. . . .	. . . .	. . . .	*kamene-m,*	. . . .	*kamene-ch.*
imen-a,	*imen-a,*	*imeny,*	*imene-m,*	*imen,*	*imene-ch.*
mater-e,	. . . .	*mater-mi,*	*matere-m,*	. . . .	. . . .
nebes-a,	*nebes-a,*	*nebesy,*	*nebese-m,*	*nebes,*	*nebesỵe-ch.*[9]
telỵat-a,	*telỵat-a,*	*telỵaty,*	*telỵate-m,*	*telỵat,*	*telỵate-ch.*

---

[1] See §. 274. [2] See §. 271. [3] See §. 275.

[4] From *SYNOVO*, see §.275. In the locative occur also *synovo-ch* and *synove-ch*.

[5] See §. 277. [6] See §. 276. [7] See §. 278. [8] See §. 279.

[9] One would expect *nebese-ch;* but in this case *ech* and *ỵech* are frequently interchanged with one another, and the form *ỵech* appears to agree better with the preceding *s* (comp. Dobrowsky, p. 477).

ADJECTIVES.

[G. Ed. p. 366.] 281. The declension of the adjective is not distinct from that of the substantive; and if some inflected forms, which in the Sanskṛit and Zend belong only to the pronouns, have, in the cognate languages, emerged from the circle of the pronouns, and extended themselves further, they have not remained with the adjectives alone, but have extended themselves to the substantives also. As regards the Greek, Latin, and Sclavonic, we have already explained at §§. 228. 248. and 274. what has been introduced from pronominal declension in those languages into general declension: we will here only further remark that the appended syllable *sma*, in §. 165. &c., which, in Sanskṛit, characterises only the pronominal declension, may in the Pâli be combined also, in several cases, with masculine and neuter substantive and adjective bases, and indeed with all bases in *a*, *i*, and *u*, including those which, originally terminating in a consonant, pass by augment or apocope into the vowel declension; thus the ablative and locative singular of *kêsa*, "hair," is either simply *kêsâ* (from *kêsât*, see p. 300), *kêsê*, or combined with *sma* or its variation *mha*, *kêsa-smâ*, *kêsa-mhâ*, *kêsa-smiṅ*, *kêsa-mhi*. In the Lithuanian, this syllable, after dropping the *s*, has, in the dative and locative singular, passed over to the adjective declension, without imparting itself to that of the substantive, and without giving to the adjective the licence of renouncing this appended syllable; as, *géram*, "*bono*," *geramé*, "*in bono*." According to this principle it would be possible, and such indeed was lately my intention, to explain the agreement of the Gothic full adjective dative, as *blindamma* (from *blindasma*, §. 170.), with [G. Ed. p. 367.] pronominal datives like *tha-mma*, "to this," *i-mma*, "to him"; but the examination of the Old Sclavonic declension, in which the indefinite adjectives remove themselves from all admixture of the pronominal declension, and run entirely parallel to the German strong substantive, not to the weak, has led me to the, to me, very important discovery, that Grimm's strong and Fulda's abstract-declension-form of adjectives diverges in not less than nine points from the strong substantives (*i. e.* those which terminate in the theme in a vowel), and approaches to the pronominal declension for no other reason than because, like the definite adjectives in the Sclavonic and Lithuanian, they are compounded with a pronoun, which naturally follows its own declension. As, then, the definite (so I now name the strong) adjectives are defined or personified by a pronoun incorporated with them, it is natural that this form of declension should be avoided, where the function of the inherent pronoun is discharged by a word which simply precedes it; thus we say *guter*, or *der gute*, not *der guter*, which would be opposed to the genius of our language; for it still lies in our perception that in *guter* a pronoun is contained, as we perceive pronouns in *im*, *am*, *beim*, although the pronoun is here no longer present in its original form, but has only left behind its case-termination. In comprehending, however, the definite adjective declension, the science of Grammar, which in many other points had raised itself far above the empirical perception of the language, was here still left far behind it; and we felt, in forms like *guter*, *gutem*, *gute*, more than we recognised, namely, a pronoun which still operated in spirit, although it was no longer bodily present. How acute, in this respect, our perception is, is proved by the fact that we place the definite form of the adjective beside the *ein* when deprived [G. Ed. p. 368.]

of its definitive pronominal element; but, in the oblique cases, beside the definite *eines*, *einem*, *einen*, the indefinite: *ein grosses*, *eines grossen* (not *grosses*), *einem grossen* (not *grossem*). In the accusative, *grossen* is at the same time definite and indefinite; but in the former case it is a bare theme, and therefore identical with the indefinite genitive and dative, which is likewise devoid of inflection; but in the latter case the *n* evidently belongs to the inflection.

282. The pronominal base, which in Lithuanian and Old Sclavonic forms the definite declension, is, in its original form, *ỵa* (= Sanskrit य *ya*, "which"); and has, in the Lithuanian, maintained itself in this form in several cases (see below). In the Old Sclavonic, according to §. 255. (*a.*), *ỵo* must be formed from *ỵa*; and from *ỵo* again, according to §. 255. (*n.*), *ỵe* or *e*: but the monosyllabic nature of the form has preserved it from the suppression of the *ỵ*, which usually takes place in polysyllabic words. In some cases, however, the *ỵ* has vocalized itself to *i* after the vowel has been dropped. It signifies in both languages "he"; but in Old Sclavonic has preserved, in union with *sche*, the old relative meaning (*i-sche*, "which"). The complete declension of this pronoun is as follows:—

SINGULAR.

	LITHUANIAN.		OLD SCLAVONIC.		
Nominative,	m. *ỵis*	f. *ỵi*,	m. *i*,*	f. *ỵa*,*	n. *ỵe*.*
Accusative,	m. *ỵiṅ*,	f. *ỵeṅ*,	m. *i*,	f. *ỵû*,	n. *ỵe*.
Instrumental,	m. *ỵů*,	f. *ỵè*,	m. n. *im*.	f. *ỵeỵû*,	
Dative,	m. *ỵám*,	f. *ỵei*,	m. n. *ỵemû*,	f. *ỵeĭ*,	
Genitive,	m. *ỵo*,	f. *ỵôs*,	m. n. *ỵego*,	f. *ỵeỵa*,	
Locative,	m. *ỵamè*,	f. *ỵoỵè*,	m. n. *ỵem*,	f. *ỵeĭ*,	

---

* Occurs only as the relative in union with *sche*.

PLURAL.

		LITHUANIAN.		OLD SCLAVONIC.
Nominative,	m.	*ỵie* (*ỵi*),	f. *ỵos*,	m. *i*,* f. n. *ỵo*.*
Accusative,	m.	*ỵůs*,	f. *ỵes*,	m. f. n. *ỵa*.
Instrumental,	m.	*ỵeis*,	f. *ỵomis*,	m. f. n. *imi*.
Dative,	m.	*ỵiems*,	f. *ỵoms*,	m. f. n. *im*.
Genitive,	m. f.	*ỵû*,		m. f. n. *ich*.
Locative,	m.	*ỵůsè*,	f. *ỵosà*,	m. f. n. *ich*.

DUAL. [G. Ed. p. 369.]

		LITHUANIAN.		OLD SCLAVONIC.
Nominative,	m.	*ỵu* (*ỵů*),	f. *ỵì*,	....
Accusative,	m.	*ỵuṅ*,	f. *ỵin*,	....
Dative,	m.	*ỵiém*,	f. *ỵom*,	Instr. Dat. m. f. n. *ỵima*.
Genitive,	m. f.	*ỵû*,		Gen. Loc. m. f. n. *yeỵû*.

283. The Lithuanian unites, in its definite declension, the pronoun cited—which, according to Ruhig (Mielcke, p. 52.), signifies the same as the Greek article—with the adjective to be rendered definite; so that both the latter, and the pronoun, preserve their full terminations through all the cases; only the pronoun in some cases loses its *ỵ*, and the terminations of the adjective are in some cases somewhat shortened. *Géras*, "good," will serve as an example.

MASCULINE.

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
Nominative,	*gérasis*,†	*gerůỵu*,	*gerieỵi*.
Accusative,	*geraṅỵaṅ*,	*geruỵuṅ*,	*gerůsus*,
Instrumental,	*gerůỵu*,	....	*geraiseis*.
Dative,	*geramỵam*,	*giriemsiom*,‡	*geriemsiems*.
Genitive,	*geroỵo*,	....	*gerúỵû*.
Locative,	*geramỵame*,	....	*gerůsůse*.
Vocative,	*gerasis*,	*gerůỵu*	*gerieỵi*.

---

* See Note on preceding page.

† Or *gerassis*, by assimilation from *gerasyis*, as, in the Prâkṛit *ỵ* frequently assimilates itself to a preceding *s*, as *tassa*, "*hujus*," for तस्य *tasya*.

‡ The *s* of the adjective is here not in its place, and appears to be borrowed from the plural.

FEMININE.

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
Nominative,	*geroỵi,*	*gerieỵi,*	*gerosos,*
Accusative,	*geraṅỵeṅ,*	*geriỵiṅ,*	*gerases.*
Instrumental,	*geraỵe,*	....	*geromsomis.*
Dative,	*geraiỵei,*	*gerómsom,**	*geromsoms.*
Genitive,	*gerosiês,*	*gerúỵû,*	*gerúỵû.*
Locative,	*geroỵoỵe,*	....	*gerososa.*
Vocative,	*geroỵi,*	*geriỵî,*	*gerosos.*

[G. Ed. p. 370.] 284. The Old Sclavonic, differing from the Lithuanian, declines only in some cases the adjective together with the appended pronoun, but in most cases the latter alone. While, however, in the Lithuanian the appended pronoun has lost its *ỵ* only in some cases, in the Old Sclavonic that pronoun has lost, in many more, not only the *ỵ* but also its vowel, and therefore the whole base. Thus the termination alone is left. For more convenient comparison we insert here, over against one another, the indefinite and definite declension: *svỵat* (theme *SVỴATO*), "holy," may serve for example:

SINGULAR.

	MASCULINE.		FEMININE.	
	Indef.	*Def.*	*Indef.*	*Def.*
Nominative,	*svỵat,*	*svỵaty-ĭ,*[1]	*svỵata.*	*svỵata-ỵu.*
Accusative,	*svỵat,*	*svỵaty-ĭ,*[1]	*svỵatû,*	*svỵatû-ỵû.*
Instrumental,	*svỵatom,*	*svỵaty-m,*[1]	*svỵatoỵû,*	*svỵato-ỵû.*[3]
Dative,	*svỵatû,*	*svỵato-mû,*	*svỵatye,*	*svỵato-i.*[4]
Genitive,	*svỵata,*	*svỵata-go,*	*svỵaty,*	*svỵaty-ỵa.*
Locative,	*svỵatye,*	*svỵato-m,*[2]	*svỵatye,*	*svỵato-i.*[4]

---

* See Note ‡ on preceding page.

[1] See §. 255. *d.*

[2] Or *svatye-m*, in which, as in the Lithuanian, the adjective is inflected at the same time.

[3] The indefinite and definite forms are here the same, for this reason, that *svỵato-ỵeỵû*, as the latter must originally have been written, has dropped the syllable *ỵe*. The adjective base *svỵata* has weakened its *o* to *a* before the pronominal addition (§. 255. *a.*), just as in the dative and locative *svỵato-i*, where an external identity with the indefinite form is not perceptible.

[4] Or *svỵatye-i*. Comp. Note 2.

PLURAL.

	MASCULINE.		FEMININE.	
	Indef.	*Def.*	*Indef.*	*Def.*
Nominative,	*svyati,*	*svyati-i,*	*svyaty,*	*svyaty-ya.*
Accusative,	*svyaty,*	*svyaty-ya,*	*svyaty,*	*svyaty-ya,*
Instrumental,	*svyaty,*	*svyaty-imi,*[5]	*svyata-mi,*	*svyaty-imi.*[7]
Dative,	*svyatom,*	*svyaty-imi,*[5]	*svyata-m,*	*svyaty-im.*[7]
Genitive,	*svyat,*	*svyaty-ich,*	*svyat,*	*svyaty-ich.*
Locative,	*svyatyech,*	*svyaty-ich,*[5]	*svyata-ch,*	*svyaty-ich.*[7]

	SINGULAR.		PLURAL.	
	NEUTER.			
	Indef.	*Def.*	*Indef.*	*Def.*
Nom. Accus.	*svyato,*	*svyato-e,*	*svyata,*	*svyata-ya.*

The rest like the masculine.

---

[5] I give those forms which, according to Dobrowsky (p. 302.), occur in the oldest MSS., in place of the more ordinary forms, which have lost the *i* of the pronominal base: *svyaty-mi, svyaty-m, svyaty-ch.*

[6] Although in the pronominal declension the genitive plural is externally identical with the locative, we must nevertheless, in my opinion, separate the two cases, in respect to their origin. I find, however, the reason of their agreement in this, that the Sanskrit, which in this case is most exactly followed by the German and Sclavonic, in pronouns of the third person begins the plural genitive termination with a sibilant, Sanskrit *sâm*, Gothic *zê* (for *sê*, §. 248.). This *s*, then, has, in Old Sclavonic, become *ch*, just like that of the locative characteristic सु *su* (§. 279.). The nasal of साम् *sâm* must, according to rule, be lost (§. 255. *l.*): the vowel, however, has, contrary to rule, followed it, as also in the ordinary declension the termination *âm* has entirely disappeared (§. 278.); and the same relation which *imen*, "*nominum,*" has to the Gothic *naman-ê*, *tye-ch*, "*horum,*" has to *thi-ze*. This *tye-ch*, however, answers as genitive to the Sanskrit तेषाम् *tê-ṣhâm*, and as locative to तेषु *tê-ṣhu*; *ye* being used in both cases for ए *ê*, according to §. 255. (*e.*)

[7] See Notes 5 and 6. The identity with the masculine and neuter forms arises from this, that the grave *a* of the feminine adjective base is changed into the lighter *o*; and this again, as in the masculine neuter, is converted, according to §. 225. (*d.*), into *y*.

[G. Ed. p. 371.] 285. As in the Sanskṛit the preponderatin
majority of adjective bases end in the masculine and neute
in *a*, and in the feminine in *á*; and as this class is, in th
Old Sclavonic, only represented by bases in *o*, *yo* in the mas
culine and neuter (see §. 257.), and *a*, *ya* in the feminine
it is not surprising that in German also, with the excep
tion of a few in *u* (of the comparative and particip
present), all other adjective bases, in their original con
dition, end in *a*, feminine *o* for *á* (§. 69.). It is, howeve
remarkable, and peculiar to the German, that its adjective
in their indefinite condition, have all lengthened their them
[G. Ed. p. 372.] by an unorganic *n*, and that in substantive
the class of words in *n* appears to be the most generally mad
use of, inasmuch as a large number of words, whose base
in Gothic terminate in a vowel, have, in the more moder
dialects, permitted this to be increased by *n*. The reaso
however, why the indefinite adjectives—not simply in par
and for the first time in the more modern dialects, b
universally, and so early as in Gothic—have passed in
the *n* declension, is to be sought for in the obtuseness
the inflection of this class of words, which, according
§§. 139. 140., in common with the Sanskṛit, Latin, a
Greek, omits the nominative sign, and then, in varian
from the older languages, dispenses also with the dati
character, upon the loss of which, in Old High Germa
has followed, also, that of the genitive character. This a
sence of the animating and personifying mark of ca
might belong to the indefinite adjective, because it fee
itself more exactly defined through the article which pr
cedes it, or through another pronoun, than the defini
adjective; the pronoun of which, incorporated with it, h
for the most part left behind only its case termination
In the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, in which the article
wanting, and thereby an inducement further to weaken t
declension of the indefinite adjectives, the latter stand on

equal footing with Grimm's strong declension of substantives, *i.e.* they maintain themselves, without an unorganic consonantal augment, in the genuine, original limits of their base.

286. As the feminine, where it is not identical, as in adjective bases in *i* in the Sanskṛit, Greek, and Latin, with the theme of the masculine and neuter, is always, in the Indo-European family of languages, made to diverge through an extension or an addition to the end, it is important for German Grammar to remark—and I have already called attention to this point in another place—that the feminine of the German indefinite adjective, in variance from the principle which has been [G. Ed. p. 373.] just given, has not arisen from its masculine, but from an older form of the feminine; *e.g.* the primitive feminine *BLINDA* m. n. "blind," has extended itself in the indefinite to *BLINDAN*, and the primitive feminine *BLINDŌ* to *BLINDŌN*: one must not, therefore, derive the latter, although it is the feminine of *BLINDAN* m., from this, as it is entirely foreign to the Indo-European family of languages to derive a feminine base through the lengthening of the last letter but one of the masculine and neuter. As far as regards the declension of *BLINDAN* m., it follows precisely that of *AHMAN* (p. 322 G. ed.), and *BLINDAN* n., that of *NAMAN* (p. 176 G. ed. &c.); the fem. *BLINDŌN* differs from the masculine only by a more regular inflection, since its *ô* remains everywhere unchanged, while *a*, in the genitive and dative singular, is, according to §. 132., weakened to *i*; therefore—

	MASCULINE.		NEUTER.		FEMININE.	
Theme,	*BLINDAN.*		*BLINDAN.*		*BLINDŌN.*	
	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
N. V.	*blinda'*,[1]	*blindan-s*,	*blindô'*,[2]	*blindôn-a*,[2]	*blindô'*,	*blindôn-s*.
Acc.	*blindan*,	*blindan-s*,	*blindô'*,[2]	*blindôn-a*,[2]	*blindôn*,	*blindôn-s*.
Dat.	*blindin*,[1]	*blinda'-m*,	*blindin*,[1]	*blinda'-m*,	*blindôn*,	*blindô'-m*,
Gen.	*blindin-s*,[1]	*blindan-ê*,	*blindin-s*,[1]	*blindôn-ê*,[2]	*blindôn-s*,	*blindôn-ô*.[3]

---

[1] See §. 140.
[2] See §. 141.
[3] See §. 245.

287. In order, then, to examine the definite declension of adjectives in Gothic, we will, in the first place, for the purpose of bringing into view their agreement and discrepancy with substantives and simple pronouns, place by the side of each other the declension of the definite *BLINDA* m. n. and *BLINDŌ* f., and that of *VULFA* m., "wolf," *DAURA* n., "a gate," *GIBŌ* f., a gift," and the interrogative [G. Ed. p. 374.] *HVA* m. n., "who?" "what?" *HVŌ* f.; further, that of *MIDỴA* m. n. (*medius*), *MIDỴŌ* f., by that of *HARỴA* m., "an army," *BADỴA* n., "a bed," *KUNTHỴŌ* f., "news," and *HVARỴA* m. n., "who?" "what?" *HVARỴŌ* f.

MASCULINE.

	SINGULAR.			PLURAL.		
N.	*vulf's,*	*blind's,*	*hva-s,*[1]	*vulfôs,*[2]	*blindai,*	*hvai,*[3]
A.	*vulf',*	*blindana,*	*hva-na,*	*vulfa-ns,*	*blindans,*	*hva-ns.*
D.	*vulfa,*[4]	*blindamma,*	*hva-mma,*[5]	*vulfa-m,*	*blindaim,*	*hvai-m.*
G.	*vulfi-s,*	*blindis,*	*hvi-s,*	*vulf'-ê,*	*blindaizê,*	*hvi-zê.*
V.	*vulf',*	*blind's,*	....	*vulfôs,*	*blindai,*	....
N.	*harỵi-s,*[6]	*midỵis,*[7]	*hvarỵi-s,*	*harỵôs.*[2]	*midỵai,*	*hvarỵai.*[3]
A.	*hari,*[8]	*midỵana,*	*hvarỵa-na,*	*harỵa-ns,*	*midỵans,*	*hvarỵa-ns.*
D.	*harỵa.*	*midỵamma,*	*hvarỵa-mma,*	*harỵa-m,*	*midỵaim,*	*hvarỵai-m.*
G.	*harỵi-s,*	*midỵis,*	*hvarỵ-is,*	*harỵ-ê,*	*midỵaizê,*	*hvarỵaizê.*
V.	*hari,*	*midỵis,*	....	*harỵôs,*	*midỵai,*	....

---

[1] See §. 135.

[2] See §. 227.

[3] See §. 228.

[4] See §. 160.

[5] See §. 171.

[6] From *harỵa-s,* see §. 135.

[7] The nominative in adjective bases in *ỵa* does not occur, unless perhaps in the fragments which have last appeared; and I have here formed it by analogy with *harỵis* and *hvarỵis*. Grimm gives *midis* (I. 170.). If, l. c., the form *ỵis* is considered as unorganic, and, in regard to *midis,* if its analogy with *hardus* is remembered, then Grimm is wrong in taking *MIDI* for the theme, as in reality *HARDU* is the theme of *hardus*. The true theme *MIDỴA* occurs, however, in the comp. *midỵa-sveipains,* "deluge," and answers

NEUTER.

	SINGULAR.			PLURAL.		
N. A. V.	*daur'*,	*blindata,*[9]	*hva.*[9]	*daura,*	*blinda,*	*hvô.*

The rest like the masculine.

N. A. V.	*badi,*	*midỵata,*[9]	*hvarỵa-ta,*	*badỵa,*	*midỵa,*	*hvarỵa.*

The rest like the masculine.

FEMININE. [G. Ed. p. 375.]

	SINGULAR.			PLURAL.		
N.	*giba,*	*blinda,*	*hvô.*	*gibôs,*[2]	*blindôs,*[2]	*hvôs.*[2]
A.	*giba,*	*blinda,*	*hvô.*[11]	*gibô-s,*	*blindôs,*	*hvô-s.*
D.	*gibai,*[12]	*blindai,*[12]	*hvizai.*[13]	*gibô-m,*	*blindaim,*	*hvai-m.*
G.	*gibô-s,*	*blindaizôs,*[13]	*hvizô-s.*[13]	*gib'-ô,*	*blindaizo,*	*hvi-zô.*
V.	*giba,*	*blinda?*	. . . .	*gibôs,*	*blindôs,*	. . . .
N.	*kunthi,*[14]	*midỵa,*	*hvarỵa.*	*kunthỵôs,*[2]	*midỵôs,*[2]	*hvarỵos.*[2]
A.	*kunthỵa,*	*midỵa,*	*hvarỵa.*	*kunthỵô-s,*	*midỵôs,*	*hvarỵô-s.*
D.	*kunthỵai,*[12]	*midỵai,*[12]	*hvarỵai.*[12]	*kunthỵô-m,*	*midỵôm,*	*hvarỵô-m.*
G.	*kunthỵô-s,*	*midỵaizôs,*	*hvarỵaizôs.*[13]	*kunthỵ-ô,*	*midỵ'ô,*	*hvarỵ'ô.*
V.	*kunthi,*	*midỵa.*	. . . .	*kunthỵôs,*	*midỵôs,*	*hvarỵôs.*

---

answers to the Sanskrit मध्य *madhya*. Formed from *midỵa* as theme, *midỵis* would be clearly more organic than *midis*. Adjective *i* bases, which could be referred to *hardu-s* as *u* base, do not exist, but only substantive, as *GASTI*, nom. *gasts*.

[8] Compare Zend forms like 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬍𐬨 *tûirîm*, "*quartum*," from 𐬙𐬏𐬌𐬭𐬌𐬌𐬀 *tûirya* (§. 42.).

[9] *Hva*, with suppressed termination, for *hvata*, Old High German *huaz*, see §§. 155. 156.; for *blindata* also *blind;* and so for *midỵata* also *midi*.

[10] The form *hvô*, which, like some others of this pronoun, cannot be shewn to occur, is, by Grimm, rightly formed by analogy from *thô*, "*hæc*." Grimm here finds, as also in the accusative singular, the *ô* in opposition to the *a* of *blinda* surprising: the reason of the deviation, however, is fixed by §§. 69. 137. 231.

[11] See p. 173, Note †.

[12] See §. 161.

[13] §. 172.

[14] For *kunthỵa*, from *kunthỵô*, by suppression of the final vowel of the base, which again appears in the accusative, but shortened to *a* (see §. 69.); but here, also, the final vowel can be dropped; hence *kunthi* as accusative. Luc. 1. 77.

If, then, it is asked which pronoun is contained in the German definite adjective, I answer, the same which, in Sclavonic [G. Ed. p. 376.] and Lithuanian, renders the adjective definite, namely, the Indian relative *ya* (य *ya*). This pronoun in German, indeed, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, does not occur isolated in its inflected state; but it is not uncommon in the history of languages, that a word has been lost in regard to its isolated use, and has been preserved only in composition with other words. It should be observed, too, that a demonstrative *i* base must be acknowledged to belong to the Sanskṛit, which, in Latin, is completely declined; in Gothic almost completely; but in Sanskṛit, except the neuter nominative accusative *idam*, "this," has maintained itself only in derivative forms, as इति *i-ti*, इत्थम् *it-tham*, "so," इयत् *iy-at*, "so much," ईदृश *î-dṛiśa*, "such." The case is the same in Gothic, with the pronominal base *ya*: from this comes, in my opinion, the affirmative particle *ya*, as in other languages, also, affirmation is expressed by pronominal forms (*i-ta*, तथा *ta-thâ*, "so," οὕτως), and further *yabai*, "if," analogous with *ibai*, "whether," *ibaini*, "lest"; as also, in Sanskṛit, यदि *yadi*, "if," comes from the same base, and to this, as I now believe, the Greek εἰ—the semi-vowel being laid aside—has the same relation as in Prâkṛit, in the 3d person singular present, *ai*, *e.g.* भमइ *bhamai*, "he wanders" (Urvasi by Lenz, p. 63), has to the more usual अदि *adi*, for the Sanskṛit अति *ati*. In Prâkṛit, too, जइ *jai* (l. c. p. 63 on *j* for *y*, see §. 19.), really occurs for *yadi*; so that in this conjunction, as in the 3d person of the present λέγει from λέγετι), the Greek runs parallel to the corruption of the Prâkṛit. If, however, in εἰ the Sanskṛit य् *y* has disappeared, as in the Æolic ὔμμες=Sanskṛit *yushmê*, it appears as *h* in ὅς, which has nothing to do with the article ὁ, ἡ, where *h* falls only to the nominative masculine and feminine, while in ὅς it runs through all the cases, as in Sanskṛit the य् *y* of यस् *ya-s*. To this [G. Ed. p. 377.] यस् *yas*, *ὅς*, in regard to the rough breathing, bears the same relation as *ὑμεῖς* to युष्मे *yuṣhmê*, *ἅζω*, *ἅγιος* to यज् *yaj*, "to worship," "to sacrifice," यज्य *yajya*, "to be worshiped;" *ὑσμίν* to युध् *yudh*, "to strive," युध्म *yudhma*, "strife" (comp. Pott, pp. 236. 252.). But to return to the Gothic *ỴA*, let us further observe *ỵah*,* "and," "also," with *h* enclitic, of which hereafter, and *ỵu*, "now," *i.e.* "at this time," "already" (comp. Latin *jam*). It also clearly forms the last portion of *hvar-ỵis* (for *ỵas*), as, in the Sclavonic, this pronoun often unites itself with almost all others, and, for example, is contained in *ky-i*, "who?" although the interrogative base also occurs without this combination.

288. In Gothic definite adjectives the pronominal base *ỴA* shews itself most plainly in bases in *u*. Of these, indeed, there are but a few, which we annex below,† but a *ỵa* shews itself in all the cases, and these in *blinds* differ from the substantive declension, to such an extent that before the *ỵ* the *u* of the adjective is suppressed, as in Sanskṛit before the comparative and superlative suffixes *îyas*, *iṣhṭha*; e.g. *laghîyas*, "more light," *laghiṣhṭha*, "most light," for *laghv-îyas*, *laghv-iṣhṭha* from *laghu*; and as, even in Gothic, *hardʼ-izô*, "more hard" (according to

---

* The *h* may assimilate itself to the initial consonant of the following word, and thus may arise *ỵag*, *ỵan*, and *ỵas*, and in conjunction with *thê*: *ỵatthê*, "or" (see Massmann's Gloss.).

† *Aggvus*, "narrow," *aglus*, "heavy," *glaggvus*, "industrious," *hardus*, "hard," *manvus*, "ready," *thaursus*, "dry," *thlaqvus*, "tender," *seithus*, "late," *filus*, "much," and, probably, *hnasqvus*, "tender." Some occur only as adverbs, as *glaggvu-ba*, "industriously." In addition to the adverb *filu*, "much," since Grimm treated this subject the genitive *filaus* has been found (*filaus mais*, "for much more," see Massmann's Gloss.), which is the more gratifying, as the adjective *u* bases had not yet been adduced in this case.

[G. Ed. p. 378.] Massmann, p. 48), for *hardv-izô*? from *HARDU.* Hitherto, however, only the accusative singular masculine *thaurś-ỵana, "siccum," manv'-ỵana, "paratum"*; the accusative singular neuter *manv'-ỵata*; the dative plural *hnasqv'-ỵaim* are adduceable, if Grimm, as I doubt not, is right in ascribing to this word, which is not to be met with in any other case, a nominative *hnasqvus.** Finally. also, the accusative plural masculine *unmanv'-ỵans, ἀπαρασκευάστους* (2 C. 9. 4.), although, in this case, *blindans* is not different from *vulfans.* These examples, then, although few, furnish powerful proof; because, in the cases to be met with, they represent an entire class of words—viz. the definite adjective in *u*—in such a manner, that not a single variety of form occurs. It may be proper to annex here the complete definite declension of *MANVU*, as it is either to be met with, or, according to the difference of cases, is, with more or less confidence, to be expected:—

	MASCULINE.		FEMININE.	
	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
N.	*manvu-s,*	(*manv'-ỵai*),	*manvu-s,*	(*manv'-ỵôs*).
Ac.	*manv'-ỵa-na,*	*manv'-ỵa-ns,*	(*manv'-ỵa,*)	(*manv'-ỵôs*),
D.	(*manv'-ỵa-mma*),	*manv'-ỵai-m,*	(*manv'-ỵai*),	(*manv'-ỵaim*).
G.	*manvau-s,*	(*manv-ỵaizê*),	(*manv'-ỵaizôs*),	(*manv'-ỵaizô*.

[G. Ed. p. 379.]

NEUTER.	SINGULAR	PLURAL.
Nom. Accus.	*manv'-ỵa-ta,*†	(*manv'-ỵa*).

---

* I am the more inclined to agree with him, as a few other adjective bases in *vu* occur. Perhaps a euphonic influence of the *v* on the vowel which follows it is also at work; as at times one finds in the Prâkṛit a final *a* changed through the influence of a preceding ण् *ṇ*, र् *r*, or ळ *l*, to उ *u*. So Urvasi, p. 72, *âlu, tâlu, âvaraṇu*, for *kâla, tâla, âvaraṇa*; p. 71, *maṇôharu* for *maṇôhara.*

† Without inflection and pronom. *manvu*, as स्वादु *swâdu, ἡδύ*, Lithuanian *darkù.*

"Remark 1.—Grimm finds (I. 721.) the identity of the feminine with the masculine remarkable, since he, as it appears, looks upon *s* as an originally mere masculine termination (comp. l. c. 824, 825.[2. 3.]). That, however, the feminine has equal claim to *s* as the nominative character, and that it is entirely without inflection where this is wanting, I think I have shewn in §§. 134. 137. Adjective bases in *i*, which in the Gothic, as in the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, are wanting, end, in the Sanskṛit, Greek, and Latin, in the nominative of both genders, in *is*; and only the neuter is devoid of inflection: compare शुचिस् *śuchi-s* m. f., "clean," *śuchi* n., with *ἴδρι-ς, ἴδρι, facili-s, facile.* Adjectives in *u*, in Sanskṛit, frequently leave, in like manner, the feminine base undistinguished from the masculine and neuter, and then end, according to §. 234., in the nominative in *u-s*; so *pâṇḍu-s* m. f., agrees with *manvu-s* above, and the neuter *pâṇḍu* with *manvu*. If two consonants do not precede the final उ *u*, as in *pâṇḍu*, the feminine base may, except in compound words, be lengthened by an *î*, which is particularly characteristic of this gender; and thus स्वाद्वी *swâdwî*, "the sweet" (theme and nominative), answers to the Greek word *ἡδεῖα*, which is lengthened by an unorganic *a* (§. 119.), for *ἡδϝια*; and *swâdu-s* answers both as feminine and masculine nominative to the Gothic *manvus*. In the Sanskṛit, also, a short *u* in the feminine base may be lengthened, and thus the feminine of तनु *tanu*, "thin," is either *tanu* or *tanû*, whence the nominative *tanû-s*; and *tanwî*, as substantive, means the "slender woman." The Lithuanian has adjective bases in *u*, as *szwiesu-s*, m. "light," "clear," (compare श्वेत *śwêta*, "white,") which nevertheless, in several cases, replace the *u* by *a*; as *szwiesám dangui*, "to the bright heaven": in some, too, they prefix an *i* to the *a*, the assimilating power of which changes the *a* into *e* (comp. p. 169 Note); as, *szwiesiems dangums*, "to the bright heavens." The feminine is, in the nominative, *szwiesi*, the

[G. Ed. p. 380.] final *i* of which is evidently identical with the Sanskrit ई *î* in *swâdwî.* In the oblique cases, however, an unorganic *a* also is added to the Lithuanian *i*, as it has been in ἡδεῖα: this *ia*, however, becomes either by euphony, *e* (comp. p. 174, Note *), *e.g.* accus. *szwiesen̓*, accus. plural *szwiesès;* or it happens, and that, indeed, in the majority of cases that the *i* is entirely suppressed, so that *SZWIESA* passes as the theme; as *szwiesòs rankòs*, "of the bright hand" (gen. *szwiesai rankai* (dat.). The *i* of *ia*, however, appears, as with the participles, to have communicated itself from the feminine to the masculine,

"Remark 2.—With the accusative *manvỵana* which has been cited, the conjectured dative *manvỵamma* is least doubtful. That Grimm should suggest forms like *hardv-amma, hardv-ana,* arises from his regarding *amma, ana,* as the dative and accusative terminations of the pronoun and adjective; while, in fact, the terminations are simply *mma* and *na*. When, therefore, *HARDU,* in the dative and accusative, without annexing a pronoun, follows nevertheless the pronominal declension, the cases mentioned must be written *hardu-mma, hardu-na,* analogous with *tha-mma, tha-na, i-mma, i-na.* If, however, contrary to all expectation, forms like *hardvamma, hardvana,* shew themselves, they must be deduced from *hardu-ỵa-mma, hardu-ỵa-na;* so that after suppressing the *ỵ*, the preceding *u*, in the place in which it would be left, has passed into *v*. With regard to *blindamma, blindana, blindata,* it is doubtful whether they ought to be divided *blind'-(ỵ)amma, blind'-(ỵ)ana, blind'-(ỵ)ata,* as analogous with *manv(u)-yamma, manv(u)--ỵana, manv(u)-ỵata,* or *blinda-(ỵa)mma,* &c.: I have therefore left them, as also the corresponding forms from *MIDỴA,* undivided. If the division *blinda-mma,* &c. is made, nothing is left of the pronoun, as in the Old Sclavonic dative *svỵato-mû,* and as in our expressions like *beim, am, im,* except the case-termination, and the adjective base has preserved its *a*. If, however, the division *blind'-amma*, &c. is made, to which I now give the preference, and which is also adopted by Grimm, though from a different point of view, then the pronoun has only lost its *y*, as in some cases of the Lithuanian definite, *e.g.* in *gerůs-us* for *gerůs-yus* (see p. 353); and with respect to the *y* which has been dropped and the vowel which is left, *blind'-amma* would have the same relation to *blind'-yamma* as *midums*, "the middle man" (theme *MIDUMA*), to its Sanskṛit cognate form of the same import, मध्यम *madhyama*, whose relation to *MIDUMA* I thus trace—the latter has softened the first *a* to *i*, and has changed the middle *a*, through the influence of the liquid, into *u*; and both, however, have, according to §. 66., suppressed the semi-vowel.

"Remark 3.—Although, in the accusative plural masculine, *blindans* is not different from *vulfans*, and the simple word *BLINDA* could not form aught but [G. Ed. p. 381.] *blinda-ns*; nevertheless the word *manv-yans*, mentioned above, which is of the highest importance for the Grammar, as well as the circumstance that where any inflections peculiar to the pronoun admonish us, of the existence of an inherent pronoun in the definite adjective, this inheritance really exists;—these two reasons, I say, speak in favour of dividing thus, *blind'-ans*, and of deducing it from *blind-yans*. Just in the same manner the dative *blindaim*, both through the *aim*, which occurs elsewhere only in pronouns, as through the word *hnasqv'-yaim*, mentioned above, declares itself to be an abbreviation of *blind'-yaim*; but *blindai* proves itself only by its pronominal inflection (compare *thai*, *hvai*, Sanskṛit ते *tê*, के *kê*) to be an abbreviation of *blind'-ya*.

"Remark 4.—In the Sanskṛit, in some cases an *i* blends itself with the final *a*, which, with the *a* of the base, becomes *ê*: hence the instrumental plural of the Vêda dialect and of the Prâkṛit, अश्वेभिस् *aśwê-bhis* from *aśwa*, कुसुमेहिं *kusumê-hiṅ* from *kusuma*. To this *ê* answers the *ai* in

Gothic pronominal datives like *hvai-m*, "*quibus*," *tha-im*, "*his*"; as the German dative, in accordance with its origin, is identical with the old instrumental. We were, however, compelled, before we had a reason for seeking the pronoun *ẎA* in the Gothic definite adjective, to give to the extension of the base in German a wider expansion by an *i* which means nothing, than it has in the Sanskṛit; while we have now every reason, where, in Gothic definites, an *i* unsubstantiated by the oldest grammar shews itself, to recognise in the *i* a remnant of the pronominal base *ẎA*, either as a vocalization of the *y̆*, which so often occurs in the Sclavonic (see p. 354), or the *i* may be considered as an alteration of the *a* of *ẎA*, as in the Lithuanian *geras-is* for *geras-y̆is*, (p. 353). The latter view pleases me the better because it accords more closely with *blind'-amma*, *blind'-ana*, &c., from *blind'-y̆amma*, *blind'-y̆ana*. The vowel, then, which in *blind'-amma*, &c., maintains itself in its original form, appears, in this view, as *i* in the feminine singular genitive *blindaizôs*—which is to be divided *blinda-izôs*—from *blinda-y̆izôs*; and this *y̆izôs* is analogous with *hvizôs*, *thizôs*, from *hvazôs*, *thazôs*, = Sanskṛit *kasyâs*, *tasyâs* (§. 172.). We must not require *blindô-izôs* — because *BLINDŌ* is the feminine adjective base—for there is a reason for the thinning of the *ô*, in the difficulty of placing the syllables together, and *a* is the short of *ô* (§. 69.). For the rest, let it be considered, that in the Sclavonic the graver feminine *a* before its union with the pronoun is weakened to the lighter masculine *o* (p. 354, Note 3.); and that a diphthong *oi* in the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 382.] is never admissible; on which account *salbô*, "I anoint," in the subjunctive suppresses the *i*, which belongs to this mood (*salbôs*, *salbô*, for *salbôis*, *salbôi*). In the feminine dative one should expect *blindaizai* for *blindai*, which is simple, and answers to *gibai*, while the remaining German dialects are, in this case, compounded in the very same manner: in Old High German the genitive is *plintera*, and the dative *plinteru*.[*] In the genitive plural masculine and neuter the *ai* in *blindaize* might be substantiated through the Sanskrit ए *ê* of the pronominal genitive, as तेषाम् *têṣhâm*, "*horum*"; and therefore the division *blindai-ze* or *blind'-(ỵ)aize* should be made: as, however, the monosyllabic pronominal bases, in which one would rather expect a firm adherence to the old diphthong (comp. §. 137.), do not retain it, and *thi-zê*, "*horum*," *hvi-zê*, "*quorum*," as weakened forms of *tha-zê*, *hva-zê*, are used; and in the feminine *thi-zô*, *hvi-zô*, for *thô-zô*, *hvô-zô*,=Sanskrit *tâ-sâm*, *kâ-sâm*; I therefore prefer to substantiate in a different way the *ai* in *blindaizê* m. n., and *blindaizô* f., than by the Sanskrit *ê* of *tê-ṣhâm* m. n. (f. *tâ-sâm*), which, moreover, would not be applicable to the feminine form *blindaizô*; and I do it, in fact, by the pronominal base *ɎA*, so that *blinda-izê blinda-izô*, is the division to be made according to the analogy of *blinda-izôs*.

"Remark 5.—The nominative masculine and feminine has kept itself free, in Gothic, from union with the old relative base, and has remained resting upon the original, as received from the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. The masculine *blinds*, also, through the very characteristic and animated *s* (see §. 134.). has cause to feel itself personified and defined determinately enough. Even if *blinds* could be looked upon as an abbreviation of *blindeis* (comp. *altheis*, "old," from the base *ALTHɎA*, according to Massmann), or of *blindais*, to which the Old High German *plinter* would give authority, I should still believe that neither the one nor the other has existed in Gothic, as even the *u* bases, like *manvu-s* above, which, in the oblique cases, shew so clearly the pronominal base *ỴA*, have not received it in the nominative singular of the personal genders. In Old High German, however, the pronoun spoken of has had time, in the space of almost four centuries which intervene between its oldest memorials and Ulfilas, to raise itself up from the oblique cases to the nominative; which was the more desirable, as the Old High German substantive declen- [G. Ed. p. 383.] sion in the nominative masculine, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, omits the mark of case. *Plintêr* (the length of the *ê* is here rendered certain) is contracted from *plinta-ir* (for *plinta-ỵir*); for the Old High German *ê* corresponds, according to §. 78., to the Gothic *ai*. In the feminine, therefore, the form *plintỵu*, which occurs in the chief number of strict Old High German authorities, and those which, as Grimm remarks, are the oldest of all, has good substantiation, and corresponds very fitly to the masculine *plintêr;* and in the nominative and accusative plural and neuter the form *plint-ỵu*, with regard to the retaining the *y* of the pronoun, is more genuine than the Gothic *blind-a* for *blind-ỵa*. The form *plintỵu*, moreover, answers to feminine pronominal forms like *dỵu*, "the" (f.), *sỵu*, "she," *dësỵu* (*dë-sỵu*), "this"* (f.), and to the instrumental masculine and neuter *dỵu* (in the interrogative *huiu*), where all authorities concur in retaining the *i* or *ỵ*; while in the adjective, Otfrid, and, as Grimm remarks, here and there Isidore and Tatian, have *u* for *ỵu*, For explanation, however, of the pronominal forms which have been mentioned, it is important to consider, that in the Sanskṛit the pronominal base *ta*, or the *sa* which supplies its place in the nominative masculine and feminine, unites itself with the relative base य *ya*, by which the first pronoun loses its vowel. Compare, then—

---

[*] The Gothic *ai* would lead us to expect *ê*, and this, too, is given by Grimm. As, however, with Kero, the doubling of the vowel, and, with Notker, the circumflex is wanting, I adopt in preference a shortening of the *e*, or leave the quantity undecided.

---

* As in the Old High German *i* and *j* (*ỵ*) are not distinguished in writing, it remains uncertain in many, if not in all cases, in what places of the memorials which have come down to us the sound *j*, and in what that of *i* is intended; as even where the Gothic has a *j*, it may become *i* in the Old High German. If, however, in the analogous adjective forms like *plintju* one reads *j*, which is supported by the Gothic (p 362), we must, in my opinion, leave it in the above forms also. Grimm writes *diu*, *siu*, but *dësju;* and expresses, p. 791, his opinion regarding the *i*.

SANSKṚIT.	OLD HIGH GERM.	OLD SCLAVONIC.
स्या *syâ* (= *sỵâ,*) "*hæc,*"	*sỵu, dỵu,*	*ta-ỵa.*
त्याम् *tyâm,* "*hanc,*"	*dỵa,*	*tû-ỵû.*
त्ये *tyê,* "*hi,*"	*dỵê,*	*ti-i.*
त्यास् *tyâs,* "*hæ,*" "*has,*"	*dỵô,*	*ty-ỵa.*
त्यानि *tyâni,* "*hæc,*"	*dỵu,*	*ta-ỵa.*

Here, then, in a manner as remarkable as convincing, the relation is proved in which the Old High German forms mentioned stand to the Gothic *sô, thô, thai,* [G. Ed. p. 384.] *thôs, thô:* one must first transpose these into *syô, thỵô,* &c., before they can pass as original forms for the Old High German. Our mother tongue, however, in the case before us, obtains more explanation through the Sclavonic, where the demonstrative base *TO* may indeed be simply inflected through all the cases: in several, however, which we have partly given above, it occurs also in union with *ỴO.* It is most probable, that in the Old High German the combination of the base of the article with the old relative pronoun has extended itself over all the cases of the three genders; for that it does not belong to the feminine alone is seen from the masculine and neuter instrumental form *dỵu* (*d'-ỵu*), and from the dative plural, where together with *dêm* occurs also *dỵêm* (*diêm*), and, in Notker, always *dien.* According to this, I deduce the forms *dër, dës, dëmu,* &c., from *dỵer, dỵes* (for *dỵis*), *dỵemu* (from *dỵamu*); so that, after suppression of the vowel following the *ỵ,* that letter has vocalized itself first to *i* and thence to *ë.* According to this, therefore, *dës,* and the Gothic genitive *thi-s*, would be, in their origin, just as different as in the accusative feminine *dỵa* and *thô*. In the neuter, on the other hand, *daz*—for *dỵaz*, as Gothic *blind'-ata* for *blind-ỵata*—the vowel of the base *DỴA* is left, and the semi-vowel, which above had become *ë* (from *i*) has disappeared. Further support of my views regarding the difference of bases in the Gothic *tha-na* and the Old High German *dë-n* (I give the accusative intentionally) is furnished by the demonstrative *dësêr*, which I explain as compounded, and as, in fact, a combination of the Sanskṛit त्य *tya*, mentioned at p. 383 G. ed., for *taya*, and स्य *sya* for *sa-ya*, the latter of which has a full declension in the Old Sclavonic, also, as a simple word. *Dësêr* stands, therefore, for *dỵa-säir* (*ë*=*ai*); and our Modern German *dieser* rests, in fact, upon a more perfect dialectic form than that which is preserved to us in the above *dësêr*, namely, upon *dỵa-sêr* or *dia-sêr*; referred to which the Isidorean *dhëa-sa*, mentioned by Grimm (I. 795.), at least in respect of the first syllable, no longer appears strange, for *dhëa* from *dhia* for *dhỵa*,* answers admirably to the Sanskṛit त्य *tya*, and the final syllable *sa* answers to the Sanskṛit-Gothic nominative form *sa* (Greek ὁ), which has not the sign of case.

"Remark 6.—The adjective bases which from their first origin end in *ỵa*, as *MIDỴA*=Sanskṛit *madhya*, are less favourable to the retention of the *ỵ* of the definite pronoun; for to the feminine or plural neuter *plint'-ỵu* for *plinta-ỵu* a *midỵ'-ỵu* would be analogous, which, on account of the difficulty of pronouncing it, does not occur, but [G. Ed. p. 385.] may have originally existed in the form *midỵa-ỵu*, or *mid-ỵa-ỵa*; for the masculine nominative *midỵêr* is from *midỵa-ïr* for *midỵa-ỵar*, as, in Gothic, the feminine genitive-form *midỵaizôs* from *midỵa-ỵizôs*. If, however, according to this, even *hvar-ỵaizôs* (from *hvar-ỵaỵizôs*) be used, and analogous forms in several other cases, so that the base *ỴA* is therein doubled, we must recollect, that in the Lithuanian also the base *ỴA*, besides its composition with adjectives, combines itself, also, with itself, for stronger personification; and, indeed, in such a manner, that it is then doubly declined, as *ỵis-sai* (for *ỵis-ỵai**), 'he'; *ỵo-ỵo*, 'of him,' &c."

---

* *D*, *th*, and *dh* are interchanged according to different authorities.

289. The participle present has, in Gothic, preserved only the nominative singular masculine of the definite declension, *e.g. gibands*, "giving," which may be deduced as well from a theme *GIBAND*, according to the analogy of *fiỵand-s* (see p. 164), as from *GIBANDA*, according to the analogy of *vulf'-s* (§. 135.). The Pâli (see p. 300) and Old High German support the assumption of a theme *GIBANDA*, as an extension of the original *GIBAND*; whence, then, by a new addition, the indefinite theme *GIBANDAN* has arisen, as, above, *BLINDAN* from *BLINDA*; and it is very probable that all unorganic *n* bases have been preceded by an older with a vowel termination: for as all bases which terminate in a consonant (*nd*, *r*, and *n*, §. 125.) are in their declension, with the exception of the nominative *nd-s*, alike obtuse; [G. Ed. p. 386.] so it would not be necessary for *GIBAND*, in order to belong, in the indefinite adjective, to a weak theme, or one with a blunted declension, to extend itself to *gibandan* (compare p. 302), unless for the sake of the nominative *gibanda* (see §. 140.).

290. In the Pâli, no feminine theme *charantî* has been formed from the unorganic theme *charanta*, mentioned at p. 319 G. ed.

---

* Ruhig (by Mielke, p. 68) wrongly gives *ai* as the emphatic adjunct, as the doubling of the *s* in *tassai*, *szissai*, *ỵissai* is clearly to be explained through the assimilative power of the *ỵ* (see p. 353, Note †). The termination *ai* answers to the neuter *tai*, mentioned at §. 157., for *tat*, which latter is contained in the compound *tat-tai* (comp. *kok-tai*, *tok-tai*). After two consonants, however, the *ỵ* is entirely dropped; hence *e.g. kurs-ai*, not *kurs-sai*.

for the masculine and neuter form *charanta* has arisen from the necessity of passing from a class of declensions terminating in a consonant into one more convenient, terminating with a vowel in the theme. The Sanskṛit, however, forms from bases terminating in a consonant the feminine theme by the addition of a vowel (*î*, see §. 119.); *e.g.* from *charant* m., comes *charantî*, and there was therefore no reason in the Pâli to give also to the more recent form *charanta* a feminine theme *charantâ*. Here, again, the Gothic stands in remarkable accordance with the Pâli, for it has produced no feminine base *GIBANDŌ* from the presupposed *GIBANDA*; and therefore, also, the indefinite *GIBANDAN* has no feminine, *GIBANDŌN*, nom. *gibandô*, answering to it (as *BLINDŌN* to *BLINDAN*); but the feminine form *gibandei* (*ei*=*î*, §. 70.), which has arisen from the old theme *GIBAND*, in analogy with the Sanskṛit *charantî*, has become *GIBANDEIN*, by the later addition of an *n*. Hence, according to §. 142., in the nominative *gibandei* must have arisen. It is not, however, right to regard this nominative as a production of the more recent theme, but as a transmission from the ancient period of the language, for it answers to the feminine Sanskṛit nominative *charantî* (§. 137.), and to Lithuanian forms like *sukanti*, "the turning," for which a theme *sukantin* is nowise admissible. In Latin, bases in *i* or *î*, originally feminine, must have arisen from adjective bases terminating with a consonant; thus *FERENTI* from *FERENT* (compare §. 119. *genitrî-c-s*): and this feminine *i*, as is the case in Lithuanian, as well with the participles (see p. 174, Note) as [G. Ed. p. 387.] with the adjective bases in *u* (p. 363), has in some cases no longer remembered its original destination, and been imparted to the other genders: hence the ablatives in *i* (for *i-d*), genitive plural in *i-um*, neuter plural in *ia* (*ferenti*(*d*), *ferenti-um*, *ferenti-a*); and hence is explained, what must otherwise appear very surprising, that the participles, when standing as substantives, freely take this *i*, which is introduced into them from the feminine adjective (*infante, sapiente*).

"Remark.—In the *ỵu* of *këpantỵu*, the Old High German feminine of *këpantêr*, I recognise the regular defining element, as above in *plintỵu*, answering to the masculine *plintêr*. On account of the participial feminines in *ỵu*, therefore, it is not requisite to presuppose masculines in *ỵêr*, according to the analogy of *midỵêr, midỵu, midỵaz*, partly as *këpentêr* and *këpantaz*, incline, in none of their cases, to the declension of *midỵêr, midỵaz*, and also as the derivative indefinite base in *an* has sprung from *KËPANTA*, and not from *KËPANTỴA*: therefore m. *këpanto* (=Gothic *gibanda*), f. n. *këpanta* (=Gothic *gibandô*). This only is peculiar to the Old High German participle present, in relation to other adjectives, that in its uninflected adverbial state it retains the defining pronominal base *ỴA* in its contraction to *i*; therefore *këpanti*, "giving," not *kepant*, like *plint*. It is, however, to be observed, that there is far more frequent occasion to use this form divested of case terminations in the participle present, than in all other adjectives, as the definite form in *nds* in Gothic, in the nominative singular masculine, corresponds to it; and as it may be assumed, that here the *i* supplies the place of the case termination, which has been laid aside; so that it is very often arbitrary whether the definite form of the participle, or the uninflected form in *i*, be given. So in Grimm's hymns (II. 2.), *sustollens* is rendered by the uninflected *ufpurrenti*, and *baptizans* by *taufantêr*, although the reverse might just as well occur, or both participles might stand in the same form, whether that of the nominative or adverbial. As regards the Old Saxon forms mentioned by Grimm, namely, *slâpandỵes* or *slâpandeas*, "*dormientis*," *gnornondỵê*, "*mærentes*," *buandỵum*, "*habitantibus*," they should, in my opinion, be rather adduced in proof of the proposition, that the participle present has, in the dialect mentioned, preserved the defining element more truly than other adjectives; and that those forms have maintained themselves in the degree of the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 388.] forms like *manvyana*, mentioned at p. 362, than that a theme in *ya* belonged to the Old High German participle present before its conjunction with the pronominal syllable."

DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

291. The comparative is expressed in Sanskrit by the suffix *tara*, feminine *tarâ*, and the superlative by *tama*, feminine *tamâ*, which are added to the common masculine and neuter theme of the positive; *e.g.* *puṇya-tara*, *puṇya-tama*, from *puṇya*, "pure"; *śuchi-tara*, *śuchi-tama*, from *śuchi*, "clean"; *balavat-tara*, *balavat-tama*, from *balavat*, "strong." In the Zend, through a perversion of the language 𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬀 *tara* and 𐬙𐬆𐬨𐬀 *tĕma* unite themselves with (in place of the theme) the nominative singular masculine; *e.g.* 𐬵𐬎𐬱𐬐𐬋𐬙𐬀𐬭𐬀 *huskôtara* (Vend. S. p. 383) from *huska*, nominative masculine 𐬵𐬎𐬱𐬐𐬋 *huskô*, "dry"; 𐬯𐬞𐬆𐬧𐬙𐬋𐬙𐬆𐬨𐬀 *śpĕntôtĕma* from *śpĕnta*, "holy"; 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬯𐬙𐬆𐬨𐬀 *vĕrĕthrazanśtĕma* (Vend. S. p. 43) from *vĕrĕthrazant*, nom. *vĕrĕthrazanś*, "victorious" (literally, "Vṛitra-slaying").[*] According to my opinion तर *tara* owes

---

[*] The participle present *zant*, the nominative of which I recognise in 𐬬𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬚𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀𐬧𐬯 *vĕrĕthra-zanś*, rests on the analogy of the frequently-occurring 𐬎𐬞𐬀𐬰𐬋𐬌𐬙 *upa-zôiṭ*, "let him strike"; since, in fact, the root *zan* (Sanskrit हन् *han*) suppresses its final vowel, and has treated the *a* which remains according to the analogy of the conjugation vowel of the first and sixth class (see p. 104). The Sanskrit radical हन् *han*, "slaying," which appears in वृत्रहन् *Vṛitra-han*, "Vṛitra slaying," and similar compounds, has, in Zend, taken the form *jan*, the nominative of which is 𐬘𐬁𐬋 *jâo* (Vend. S. p. 43),

its origin to the root तॄ *trī* (*tar*, §. 1.), "to [G. Ed. p. 389.] step beyond" "to place beyond" (*e.g.* "over a river"); hence, also, the substantive *tara*, "a float." In the Latin, as Lisch has acutely remarked, with this root are connected the preposition *trans*, and also *terminus*, as that which is overstepped, and probably also *tra*, in *in-tra-re*, *penetra-re*. The superlative suffix I derive, with Grimm (III. 583.), from that of the comparative, although I assume no theoretic necessity that the superlative must have been developed through the degree of the comparative. But *tama*, as a primitive, presents no satisfactory etymology. I formerly thought of the base तन् *tan*, "to extend," whence, also, τατος could be explained; but then तम *tama* would be no regular formation, and I now prefer recognising in it an abbreviation of *tarama*, partly because the superlative suffix इष्ठ *ishṭha* may be satisfactorily considered as derived from its comparative *îyas*, through the suffix *tha*, which, in the Greek, is contained in the form of το, as well in ισ-τος as in τατος, for ταρτος or ταροτος. In this manner, therefore, is formed τατο-ς and तमस् *tama-s*: they both contain the same primitive, abbreviated in a similar manner, but have taken a different derivative suffix, as in πέμπ-τος contrasted with पञ्चम *panchama*, "the fifth": the vowel, however, is more truly retained in the derivative τατος than in its base τερος. In Latin, तमस् *tama-s* has become *timu-s* (*optimus*, *intimus*, *extimus*, *ultimus*); and, by the exchange of the *t* with *s*, which is more usual in Greek than in Latin, *simus*; hence,

---

p. 43), and is analogous to the Sanskrit *panthâs*, from *panthan*, mentioned at p. 308. More usually, however, *âo* in Zend nominatives stands in the place of the Sanskrit *ân* of the suffix *vant* and *vâṅs*; so that, in Zend, the sign of the nominative has taken the place of the Indian *n*, the said sign being *o* for *s*, according to §. 56ᵇ. In 𐬬𐬃 *vâo*, from वांस् *vâṅs*, the Zend *o* may also be looked upon as belonging to the base (comp. Burnouf's Yaçna, Notes, p. cxxviii. &c.).

maximus (*mac-simus*) for *mag-simus*. However, the *simus* is generally preceded by the syllable *is*, which we will hereafter explain.

292. As in comparatives a relation between two, and in [G. Ed. p. 390.] superlatives a relation between many, lies at the bottom, it is natural that their suffixes should also be transferred to other words, whose chief notion is individualized through that of duality or plurality: thus they appear in pronouns, and कतरस् *katara-s* is "which of two persons?" and कतमस् *katama-s*, "which of more than two persons?" एकतरस् *êkataras* is "one of two persons," and *êkatama-s*, "one of more than two." It is hardly necessary to call attention to similar forms in Greek, as πότερος (for κότερος), ἑκάτερος. In ἕκαστος the superlative suffix (στος for ιστος) presents a different modification from that in *êkatama-s*, and expresses "the one of two persons," instead of "the one of many persons." In Latin and German, indeed, the suffix *tara* is not in use in genuine comparatives, but has maintained itself in pronouns in Latin in the form of *TERU* (*ter*, *teru-m*), and in Gothic in that of *THARA*; hence *uter*, *neuter*, *alter*; Gothic, *hva-thar*,* "which of two persons?" Old High German, [G. Ed. p. 391.] *huëdar*, which has remained to us in the adverb *weder*, as an abbreviation of the Middle High Ger-

---

* The Gothic resembles the Latin in withdrawing the sign of the nominative from its masculine bases in *ra*, as the latter does from its corresponding bases in *ru*. Hence, above, *hvathar* for *hvathar(a)s*, as *alter* for *alterus*; so also *vair*, "man," = Latin *vir* for *viru-s*. This suppression has, however, not extended itself universally in both languages. In the Gothic, as it appears, the *s* is protected by the two preceding consonants; hence *akrs*, "a field" (comp. Grimm, p. 599); still the adjective nominatives *gaurs*, "mournful" (theme *Gaura*, comp. Sanskṛit घोर *ghôra*, "terrible"), and *svêrs*, "honoured," occur, where this cause is wanting, where, however, the preceding long vowel and the diphthong *au* may have operated. In *vair*, indeed, a diphthong precedes; but the *a* is here first introduced through the euphonic law 82. If, in Latin, in adjective bases in *ri*, only the masculine has predominantly given up the *s*, with the preceding

man, combined with a particle of negation *newëder*. *Anthar*, also, our *anderer*, belongs here, and answers to the Sanskrit अन्तरस् *antara-s*, whose initial syllable is the same which in अन्य *anya*, "*alius*," has united itself with the relative base य *ya*. From this अन्य *anya* comes *anyatara*, "*alter*." If, however, अन्तर *antara* means, in general, "the other," the comparative suffix is here intended to denote the person following after, passing over this thing; so is, also, the Latin *ceterus* to be considered, from *ce* as demonstrative base (compare *ci-s*, *ci-tra*); and so, also, in Sanskṛit, *itara*, "the other," comes from the demonstrative base *i*, as, in Latin, the adverb *iterum* from the same base."* In our German, also, *wieder* is the comparative suffix, and the whole rests, perhaps, on a pre-existing Old High German word *huia-dar* or *hwyadar*, with a change of the interrogative meaning into the demonstrative, as in *weder*, *ent-weder*. The *wie* in *wieder*, therefore, should be regarded as, p. 370, *die* in *dieser*; and herein we may refer to the Isidoric *dhëa-sa*.

293. In prepositions, also, it cannot be surprising if one finds them invested with a comparative or superlative suffix, or if some of them occur merely with a comparative termination. For at the bottom of all genuine prepositions,

---

preceding *i*, while *e.g.* the feminine *acris* might have permitted its *is* to have been removed, just as well as the masculine, I can find the reason of this firm adherence of the feminine to the termination *is* only in the circumstance that the vowel *i* particularly agrees with that gender, as it is in Sanskṛit (although long), according to §. 119., the true vowel of formation for the feminine base. In Gothic, the suppression of the nominative sign *s* is universal in bases in *sa* and *si*, in order that, as the final vowel of the base is suppressed, two *s* should not meet at the end of the word; hence *e.g.* the nominative *drus*, "a fall," from *DRUSA*; *garuns*, "a market," from *GARUNSI*, f.

* I have traced back the comparative nature of this adverb, which Voss derives from *iter*, "the journey," for the first time in my Review of Forster's Sanskṛit Grammar in the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818. i. p. 479.

at least in their original sense, there exists a relation between [G. Ed. p. 392.] two opposite directions — thus, "over," "from," "before," "to," have the relations "under," "in," "towards," "from," as their counter-poles and points of comparison, as the right is opposed to the left; and is always expressed in Latin, also, with the comparative suffix, *dexter* (दक्षिण *dakshiṇa*), *sinister*. As, however, the comparative nature of these formations is no longer recognised in the present condition of the Latin, the suffix *ter* admits of the further addition of the customary *ior* (*dexterior*, *sinisterior*, like *exterior*, *interior*); while the superlative *timus* has affixed itself to the core of the word (*dextimus* or *-tumus*, *sinistimus*). The prepositions which, in Latin, contain a comparative suffix, are *inter*, *præter*, *propter*, the adverbially-used *subter*, and probably, also, *obiter* (compare *audacter*, *pariter*).* To *inter* answers the Sanskṛit अन्तर् *antar*, "among," "between"; for which, however, a primitive *an* is wanting, as in Sanskṛit the relation "in" is always expressed by the locative. Notwithstanding this, *antar*, in regard to its suffix, is an analogous word to प्रातर् *prâtar*, "in the morning," from the preposition [G. Ed. p. 393.] *pra*, "before,"† with a lengthened *a*, as in the

---

* I was of opinion, when I first treated this subject (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818, p. 480), that *ob-i-ter* must be so divided, and *i* looked upon as the vowel of conjunction. As, however, the preposition *ob* is connected with the Sanskṛit अभि *abhi*, "to," "towards," the division *obi-ter* might also be made, and the original form of the preposition recognised in *obi*: observe the Sanskṛit derivative अभितस् *abhi-tas*, "near," from *abhi* with the suffix *tas*. The common idea, however, that *obiter* is compounded of *ob* and *iter* cannot entirely be disproved, partly as then *obiter* would be a similar compound to *obviam*.

† Comp. *nî*, *parî*, *pratî*, for *ni*, &c. in certain compounds. Formations which do not quite follow the usual track, and are rendered intelligible by numerous analogies, are nevertheless frequently misunderstood by the Indian Grammarians. Thus Wilson, according to native authorities, derives अन्तर् *antar* from *anta*, "end," with *râ*, "to arrive at," and the

analogous

Greek πρωΐ from προ. For the relation "under," the Sanskrit has the preposition अधस् *adhas*, which I have elsewhere explained as coming from the demonstrative base अ *a*; from which, also, come अधर *a-dhara* and अधम, *a-dhama*, "the under one," or "the most under," to which *inferus* and *infimus* are akin, as *fumus* to धूमस् *dhûma-s*, "smoke," and, with a nasal prefixed, as in ἀμφί in relation to अभि *abhi*, and in ἄμφω, "*ambo*," answering to उभौ *ubhâu*, Old Sclavonic *oba*. The suffixes धर *dhara* and धम *dhama* are, in my opinion, only slightly-corrupted forms of the *tara* and *tama* mentioned in §. 291.; as also in प्रथम *prathama*, "the first," m. from *pra*, "before," the *T* sound of the suffix is somewhat differently transposed. The suffix *dhas* of *adhas*, "beneath," however, has exactly the same relation to *tas*, in अतस् *atas*, "from here," as *dhara*, *dhama*, have to *tara*, *tama*; and therefore *adhas*, as a modification of *atas*, is, in respect to its suffix, a cognate form of *subtus*, *intus*. The usual intention of the suffix तस् *tas*, like that of the Latin *tus*, is to express distance from a place. In this, also, the Greek θεν (from θες, comp. §. 217.) corresponds with it, which, in regard to its *T* sound, rests on the form धस् *dhas* in अधस् *adhas* (§. 16.), as the latter also serves as the pattern of the Old Sclavonic suffix *dû*, which only occurs in pronouns, and expresses the same relation as तस् *tas*, θεν, *tus*: *e.g.* *ovo-ûdû*, "hence,"* *ono-ûdû*, "thence." The form *dû*, however, corresponds to the euphonic alteration, which a final *as* in the Sanskrit must suffer before [G. Ed. p. 394.] sonant letters (§. 25.), viz. that into *ô* (see §. 255. *f.*), which in Zend has become fixed (§. 56^b.).

---

analogous word *prâtar* from *pra*, with *at*, "to go." A relation, nevertheless, between *anta*, "end," and *antar*, "among," cannot perhaps be denied, as they agree in the idea of room. They are, however, if they are related, sister forms, and the latter is not an offshoot of the former.

[*] The demonstrative base *OVO* answers remarkably to the Zend 𐬀𐬎𐬀 *ava*, with *ó* for *a*, according to §. 255. (*a.*).

"Remark.—Dobrowsky p. 451 gives *ûdû* as the full form of the suffix, just as he also lays down a suffix *ûdỵe*, which forms adverbs of place, as *kûdỵe*, "where?" *onûdỵe*, "there." As, however, the definitive pronoun, which has been treated of at p. 353, &c., exists in these two adverbs, *ûdû, ûdỵe*, and forms, with *sche, ûdûsche, ûdỵesche*, for *ỵûdû*, &c.; and as this pronoun is, in general, so frequently compounded with other adverbs, there is every reason to assume that it is also contained in *ovo-ûdû, ono-ûdû, on'-ûdỵe, t'-ûdỵe*, and others. But how is the *û* itself in *u-dû, ỵû-dỵe*, to be explained? I cannot speak with confidence on this point; but as, according to §. 255. (*g.*), in the last element of the diphthong *û* a vocalised nasal is sometimes recognised, *ỵudû, ỵûdỵe*, might be regarded as corruptions of *ỵondû, ỵondỵe*, and, in respect to their nasal, be compared with the Latin *inde, unde*, from *I, U*. *Ỵûdỵe, ỵûdỵû*, might also have proceeded from the feminine accusative *ỵû*, which would again conduct us to a nasal (§. 266.): this accusative would then stand as theme to the derivative adverb, as our preposition *hinter*, Old High German *hintar*, has arisen from *hin*, a petrified accusative, on which the Gothic *hina-dag*, "this day," "to day," throws light. Before the suffix *dỵe*, however, elder form *de*, occur also the pronouns in a simple form, as *gdỵe*, "where?" (more anciently *kde*, with the final vowel of the base *KO* suppressed); *zdỵe* (older *sde*), "here"; *idỵesche*, "where" (relative). As *e* (ε), according to §. 255. (*b.*), frequently stands as the corruption of an older *i*, I recognise in the suffix *de* the Sanskṛit धि *dhi*, from अधि *adhi*, "over," "upon" "towards," (from the demonstrative base *a*), which, in Greek, is far more widely diffused in the form of θι (πόθι, ἄλλοθι)"

294. In German, even more than in Latin, the prepositions shew themselves inclined to combine with the comparative suffix. To the Sanskṛit अन्तर् *antar*, Latin *inter*, mentioned above (at p. 392, G. ed.), corresponds our *unter*, Gothic

undar, with *u* for the old *a*, according to §. 66.* If, however, the, in my opinion, incontrovertible original identity of the latter with the two former is recognised, [G. Ed. p. 395.] one must not, with Grimm (III. 260.), derive *undar* from the preposition *und*, "as far as," &c., by a suffix *ar*, and so again divide the *dar;* for *undar*,† as transmitted from an ancient period of the language, was already formed, before the existence of a German dialect, and the abovementioned preposition has only to dispose itself according to the relations of sound mentioned in §§. 66. 91. The matter is different with the Old High German *af-tar*, "after," for the primitive language, or languages, transmit to us only अप *apa*, *ἀπό*, "from"; to which, in the spirit of अन्तर् *antar*, *inter*, *subter*, &c., the old comparative suffix has first united itself upon German ground. In Gothic, *aftra* means "again," which I look upon as an abbreviation of *aftara*, as in Latin *extra*, *intra*, *contra*, and others, as feminine adjectives, from *extera*, &c. In regard to the termination however, *aftra*, and similar forms in *tra*, *thra*, appear to me as datives, *i. e.* original instrumentals (§. 160.), as also, in the Sanskṛit, this case occurs as an adverb, *e. g.* in अन्तरेण *antarêṇa*, "between." Perhaps, also, the Sanskṛit pronominal adverbs in *tra*, although they have a locative meaning, like यत्र *yatra*, "where," are to be regarded as instrumental forms, according to the principle of the Zend language (§. 158.), and of the gerund in य *ya*, (Gramm. Crit. §. 638. Rem.), so that their *tra* would be to be derived from तरा *tarâ*: compare forms like मनुष्यत्रा *manuṣhya-trâ*, "*inter homines*" (Gramm. Crit.

---

* Regarding *dar* and *tar* for *thar*, see §. 91.

† Grimm however, also, at II. 121. &c., divides *brôth-ar*, *vat-ar* ("brother," "father"), although the many analogous words denoting relationship in the German and the cognate languages clearly prove the *T* sound to belong to the derivative suffix (see Gramm. Crit. §. 178. Rem.).

§. 252. suff. *trâ*). As *aftra* is related to *aftar*, so is the Gothic *vithra*, "against," to the Old High German *widar*, our *wider*, the primitive of which is supplied by the Sanskṛit through its [G. Ed. p. 396.] inseparable preposition वि *vi*, which expresses separation, distraction, *e.g.* in *visṛip*, "to go from one another," "to disperse." Exactly similar is the Sanskṛit नि *ni*, to which I was the first to prove the meaning "below" to belong,* and whence comes the adjective नीच *nîcha*, "low" (Gramm. Crit. §. 111.), the base of our *nieder*, Old High Ger- [G. Ed. p. 397.] man *ni-dar*.† From *hin-dar*, Old High German *hin-tar*, comes our *hin-ter* which has already been discussed (p. 394, G. ed. compare Grimm. III. 177. c.). In the Old High German *sun-dar*, Gothic *sun-drô*, "*seorsim*," afterwards a preposition, our *sondern*, *dar* is, in like manner, clearly the comparative suffix, and the base appears to me, in spite of the difference of signification, related to the Sanskrit सम् *sam*, "with" (compare Gothic *samath*, "together with," Old High German *samant*), and the *u*, therefore, is from *a*, according to §. 66. The Latin *con-tra*, however, is nearly just as much opposed in meaning to its primitive *cum*; and as *cum* (compare *σύν*) belongs, in like manner, to सम् *sam*, so *sundar*, *sundrô*, and *contra*, would be, in a double respect, sister forms. Observe, also, the Gothic *samath*, Old High German *samant*, "together with": the latter answers surprisingly to the Sanskrit समन्त *samanta* (from *sam* + *anta*, "an end"), the ablative of which, *samantât*, as also the adverb, *samantatas*, mean "everywhere." Perhaps, too, in all other Old High German adverbs in *nt* (Grimm. III. 214.), the said अन्त *anta* is contained, for the meaning "end," cannot be unexpected in adverbs of place and time, and, like *Mitte*, "mid,"

---

* It is usual to attribute to it the meaning "in," "into," which cannot in any way be supported.

† Grimm assents to my opinion, which has been already expressed in another place, regarding the relationship of नि *ni* and *nidar* (III. 258, 259): he wishes, however, to divide thus *nid-ar*, and to suppose a Gothic verb *nithan*, *nath*, *néthun*, to which the Old High German *ginâda* (our *Gnade*) may belong. Does, however, *gi-nâda* really signify *humilitas*? It appears that only the meaning *gratia* can be proved to belong to it; and this is also given by Grimm, I. 617. and II. 235. *gratia*, *humanitas*, where he divides *ki-nâ-da*, which appears to me correct, and according to which *nâ* would be the root, and *da* the derivative suffix; as in the etymologically clear *ki-wâ-da*, "*afflatus*," to which the Sanskṛit gives वा *wa*, "to blow," as root, the Gothic gives *vô* (§. 69.) (*vaia*, *vaivô*). To *gi-nâ-da*, indeed, the Sanskṛit supplies no root *nâ*, but perhaps *nam*, "to bend oneself," the *m* of which, according to the laws of euphony, is suppressed before *t*, which does not produce Guna; as *nata*, "bent," *nati*, "bending," with the preposition *sam*, *san-nati*, which Wilson explains by "reverence," "obeisance," "reverential salutation." As the Gothic inseparable preposition *ga*, Old High German *gi* or *ki*, is, as Grimm first acutely remarked, identical with the Sanskṛit *sam*, *gi-nâ-da* has much the same formation with *san-na-ti*: it would, however, still better agree with the feminine passive

---

passive participle *san-na-tâ*. Be that as it may, so much is certain, that there is no necessity for a hypothetic Gothic base *nith* or *nath*, either for the substantive *gi-nada* or for the preposition *nidar*, as they can be fully set at rest by the existence of a Sanskrit primitive नि *ni*, "below," and the comparative suffix *dar*, which frequently occurs in prepositions. And as the circumstance that genuine original prepositions never come from verbs, but are connected with pronouns, I must, with regard to its etymology, keep back every verb from our *nidar*. Grimm wishes also to divide the Gothic preposition *vi-thrâ*, Old High German *wi-dar*, into *vith-ra*, *wid-ar*, and to find their base in the Anglo-Saxon preposition *widh*, English *with*, Old Sclavonic *wid*, Old Norman *vidh*, Swedish *vid*, Danish *ved*, which mean "with," and, according to appearance, are wanting in the Gothic and High German. If, however, one considers the easy and frequent interchange of *v*, *b*, and *m* (वारि *vâri*, "water,"=*mare*, *βροτός*= मृतस *mritas*, "*mortuus*"), one would rather recognise, in the above prepositions, dialectic variations of sound from the Gothic *mith*, which is of the same import with them (=the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬝 *maṭ*), and which, in most of the dialects mentioned, maintains itself equally with the other forms; as it often occurs, in the history of languages, that the true form of a word is equally preserved with a corruption of it.

(compare *inmitten*, "in the midst") and *Anfang*, "beginning," it attaches itself first to the prepositional ideas: therefore *hinont*, "this side," *enont*, "that side," would be the same as "at this end," "at that end." With regard to the comparative forms there is, further, the Old High German *for-dar*, *fur-dir* ("*porro*," "*amplius*"), our *für-der* to be mentioned, whence *der vordere*, *vorderste*.

[G. Ed. p. 398.] "Remark 1.—As we have endeavoured above to explain the Gothic *af-tra* and *vithra* as datives, I believe I can with still more confidence present the forms in *thrô* or *tarô* as remarkable remains of ablatives. Their meaning corresponds most exactly to that of the Sanskṛit ablative, which expresses the withdrawing from a place, and to that of the Greek adverbs in *θεν*; thus *hva-thrô*, "whence?" *tha-thrô*, "thence," *yain-thrô*, "hence," *alya-thrô*, "from another quarter," *inna-thrô*, "from within," *uta-thrô*, "from without," *af-tarô*, "from behind," *dala-thrô*, "from under," and some others, but only from pronouns, and, what is nearly the same, prepositions. I might, therefore, derive *dalathrô*, not from *dal*, "a valley," but suppose a connection with the Sanskṛit अधर *adhara*, "the under person," with aphæresis of the *a* and the very common exchange of the *r* with *l* (§. 20.). Perhaps, however, on the contrary, *thal* is so named from the notion of the part below. As to the ablative forms in *tarô*, *thrô*, the *ô* corresponds to the Sanskṛit *ât* (§. 179.), with *ô*, according to rule, for आ *â* (§. 69.), and apocope of the *t*; so that *ô* has the same relation to the to-be-presupposed *ôt* that in Greek *οὕτω* has to *οὕτως*, from *οὕτωτ* (§. 183. Note * p. 201). Many other Gothic adverbs in *ô*, as *sinteinô*, "always," *sniumundô*, "hastily," *sprantô*, "suddenly," *thridyô*, "thirdly," &c., might then, although an ablative meaning does not appear more plainly in them than in the Latin *perpetuo*, *cito*, *subito*, *tertio*, and others, be rather considered as ablatives than as neuter accusatives of indefinite (Grimm's weak) forms; so that *thridyô* would answer to the Sanskṛit ablative *tṛitîyât,* while the common Gothic declension extends the ordinal bases in *a* by an unorganic *n*; thus *THRIDỴAN,* nom. *thridỵa.* It must be further observed, that all unorganic adjective bases in *an* are, in general, only used where the adjective is rendered definite through a pronoun preceding it; that therefore the forms in *ô,* which pass for adverbial, are, for the very reason that no pronoun precedes them, better assigned to the definite (strong) declension than to the indefinite; especially as most of them are only remains of an old adjective, which is no longer preserved in other cases, and, according to their formation, belong to a period where the indefinite adjective declension had not yet received the unorganic addition of an *n.* As to the translation of τοὐναντίον, 2 Cor. ii. 7., by *thata undaneithô,* here of course *andaneithô* is the neuter accusative; but the inducement for using the indefinite form is supplied by the article, and τοὐναντίον could not be otherwise literally rendered. The case may be similar with 2 Cor. iv. 17., where Castiglione takes *thata andavairthô* for the [G. Ed. p. 399.] nominative, but Grimm for the adverbial accusative: as it would else be an unsuitable imitation of the Greek text, where τὸ does not belong to αὐτίκα, but to ἐλαφρόν. In my opinion, however, it can in no case be inferred from these passages that the adverbs in *ô,* without an article preceding them, belong to the same category. Moreover, also, *andaneithô* and *andavairthô* do not occur by themselves alone adverbially. As, then, *thrô* has shewn itself to us to be an abbreviation of *thrôt,* it is a question whether the suppression of the *t* by a universal law of sound was requisite, as in Greek, and in the Prâkṛit, all *T* sounds are rejected from the end of words, or changed into Σ. It is certain that the *T* sounds (*t, th, d*), which, in the actual condition of the Gothic, are finals, as far as we can follow their etymology, had originally a vowel after them, so that they are final sounds of a second generation, comparable in that respect to the Sclavonic final consonants (§. 255. *l.*). This holds good, for example, with regard to *th*, *d*, in the 3d person singular and plural, and the 2d person plural = Sanskrit ति *ti*, अन्ति *anti*, थ *tha* or त *ta;* and I explain the *th* or *d*, which, in pronominal bases, expresses direction to a place, as coming from the Sanskrit suffix ध *dha* (ह *ha*); which, in like manner, in pronouns expresses the locative relation. The passing over from the locative relation to the accusative, expressing the direction whither, cannot be surprising, as, even in Sanskrit, the common locative adverbs in *tra*, and the ablatives in *tas*, occur also with accusative meaning, *i. e.* expressing the direction to a place (see *tatra* in my Glossary). The Sanskrit suffix ध *dha* appears, in common language, abbreviated to *ha*, and is found, indeed, only in *i-ha*, "here," from the pronominal base *i* and सह *sa-ha*—in the Vedic dialect and Zend *sa-dha*—which I derive from the pronominal base *sa*. It ought, according to its origin, and consistently with the usual destination of the suffix *dha*, to mean "here *or* there": it has, however, become a preposition, which expresses "with." The adverb इह *iha*, "here," is, in Zend, 𐬌𐬜𐬀 *idha*,* and fre- [G. Ed. p. 400.] quently occurs in combination with 𐬥𐬀 *na*, "not"; so that 𐬥𐬀𐬉𐬜𐬀 *naêdha*† means "nor," answering to 𐬥𐬋𐬌𐬙 *nôit*, "neither" (literally "not it," from *na*+*it*, §. 33.). From 𐬀𐬬𐬀 *ava* and 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀 *aêta*, "this" (mas.), comes 𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬜𐬀

---

* Vend. Sâde, p. 368. several times: 𐬌𐬨𐬄 𐬌𐬜𐬀 𐬬𐬀𐬗𐬋 𐬟𐬭𐬀𐬨𐬭𐬀𐬬𐬀 *imañ idha vachô framrava*, "*hæc hic verba enuntia*," which Anquetil translates by "*en prononçant bien ces paroles.*" In the same page also occurs repeatedly 𐬀𐬜𐬀 *adha*, with the same meaning, from the demonstrative base *a*, as in the Vêda's अध *adha* (Rosen's Sp. p. 10), without perceptible meaning.

† *a*+*i* makes *ê*, according to §. 2.; and from *nêdha* is formed, by §. 28., *naêdha*.

avadha and 𐬀𐬉𐬙𐬀𐬜𐬀 *aêta-dha* (Vend. S. p. 164). To the Zend-Vêdic suffix *dha* corresponds most exactly the Greek *θα*, in *ἔνθα* and *ἐνταῦ-θα*, "here." Perhaps *ἔνθα* and 𐬌𐬜𐬀 *i-dha*, इह *iha*, are, with regard to their base, identical; *ἔνθα*, therefore, is for *ἵνθα* from *ἵθα* (comp. *in*, *inde*), as nasals are easily prefixed to another consonant, and thus *ἀμφί* answers to अभि *abhi*, *ἄμφω* to उभौ *ubhâu*, Old Sclavonic *oba*; but *αὖθα*, in the triple compound *ἐν-τ'-αῦθα*, is completely the Zend 𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬜𐬀 *avadha*, whose theme *ava* has been contracted in the Greek to *αὐ* (compare *αὖ-θι* and *αὐ-τός*, the latter being combined with the article), but in the Old Sclavonic it is more correctly preserved in the form of *OVO*.* To the word इहत्य *ihatya*, "of this place," which is derived from इह *iha* through the suffix त्य *tya*, corresponds the Greek *ἐνθάσιος*, with *σ* from *τ*; compare, with regard to the suffix, the Latin *propitius* from *prope*, and, in the Gothic, *frama-thya*, "a foreigner," through which the preposition *fram* shews itself to be an abbreviation of *frama*. As in the Sanskṛit the suffix त्य *tya* belongs only to local adverbs and prepositions, so might also the Gothic *ni-thyis*, "cousin" (for *ni-thyas*, §. 135.), as *propinquus*, or one who stands somewhat lower in relationship than a brother, &c.,† be derived from the [G. Ed. p. 401.]

---

* Before my acquaintance with the Zend, and deeper examination of the Sclavonic, I believed I could make out the Greek base *αὐ* to agree with the Sanskṛit *amu*, "*ille*," by casting out the *m* (as *κοῦρος* with *kumâra*): now, however, अव *ava* and *OVO* have clearly nearer claims to take the Greek forms between them.

† Terms of relationship often express the relation, of which they are the representatives, very remotely, but ingeniously. Thus नप्तृ *naptṛi*, "a grandson," is, I have no doubt, compounded of *na*, "not," and *pitṛi*, "father"; and "not-father" is regarded as a possessive compound, "not having as father," in relation to the grandfather, who is not the father of the grandson. In Latin it would be difficult to find the etymology of *nepos* (*nepot-*)—and the same may be said of our word *neffe*—without the aid of the word *Vater*, which is fully preserved from the Sanskṛit. In the

meaning

ancient preposition *ni*, mentioned at p. 382, from which, in Sanskṛit, *nitya* actually comes, but differently related, and with a signification answering less to the meaning of the preposition, namely, *sempiternus*. In consideration of the aspirates in Greek being easily interchanged, and, *e.g.* in the Doric, Ὄρνιχ is said for Ὄρνιθ, one may also recognise in the syllable χο, in forms like παντα-χό-θεν, παντα-χό-σε, πολλαχόσε, and others, a cognate form of the suffix θα, *dha*, or of the corrupted ह *ha* (comp. §. 23.). At the bottom of these forms lies, in my opinion, as the theme, the plural neuter, which need not be wondered at, as πάντα and πολλά are also used as first members of compounds (πολλά-σημος, παντά-μορφος). Πανταχο might, in the identity of its suffix with θα, *dha*, or *ha*, mean "everywhere"; whence may then be said πανταχό-σε, "from everywhere," &c., as we combine our locative adverbs *wo* and *da* with *her* and *hin* (*woher, wohin*); and in Greek, also, ἐκεῖθι, ἐκεῖσε, ἐκεῖθεν, which might literally mean *in illic, versus illic, ab illic*, as ἐκεῖ is a local adverb. Forms in χο, however, are in a measure raised to themes capable of declension, though only for adverbs, and develope, also, case-forms, as πανταχοῦ, πανταχοῖ (old locative and dative), πανταχῆ. The addition of new suffixes or terminations to those already existing, but which are obsolete, appears to me assuredly more natural than, as Buttmann supposes, the introduction of an unmeaning αχ or even αχο, in which case we should have to divide παντ-αχό-θεν, &c. But as the χο under discussion has arisen from θα, *dha*, I think I recognise in the χι of ἦχι a corruption of the suffix θι, from धि *dhi*; in which respect might be compared ἄγχι, as a sister form to

---

meaning of *Neffe* the negation of the relationship of father points to the uncle. The Indian Grammarians, according to Wilson, see in *naptṛi* the negation, but not the father, but the root *pat*, "to fall," and a Unâdi suffix *tṛi*.

अधि *adhi*, "to," "towards," with a nasal introduced. As a third form in which the Vêdic-Zend suffix *dha* appears in Greek, I notice σε, with σ for θ, ध् *dh*, as μεσος from मध्य *madhya*, "midst," the *y* of which has assimilated itself, in the form μέσσος, to the σ. The suffix σε, however, in that it is altered from its original intention to denote rest in a place, to the expression of motion to a place, answers to the Gothic *th* or *d*, whence we set out in this examination, in forms like *hva-th*, πό-σε, "whither?" also *hvad*—John xiii. 3. *hvad gaggis*, ποῦ ὑπάγεις—*yain-d*, ἐκεῖ-σε, *alya-th*, ἄλλο-σε. To the Zend *idha*, Greek ἔνθα, corresponds *i-th*; which, however, contrary to the original intention of the form, does not mean "thither," but is used as a conjunction—"but," "if," "then" (1 Cor. vii. 7.). To this class, also, belongs *ath*, which only occurs in combination with *than* —*ath-than*, "but," like *ith-than*; and it has [G. Ed. p. 402.] the Vêdic-Zend *a-dha* as prototype (§. 399.). *Thad*, in combination with the relative particle *ei*, which is probably connected with य *ya*, has preserved the original locative meaning together with the accusative, and *thad-ei* may be cited as "where" and "whither." The *d* in these forms, answering to the Greek θ, agrees with the rule for the transmutation of sounds (§. 87.); and it is to be observed that medials at the end of a word freely pass into aspirates—compare *bauth*, *bu-dum* (§. 91.);—so that the Gothic *T* sound of the suffix under discussion, after it has, in one direction, diverged from the Greek, has, in another, again approached it.

"Remark 2.—As we have above recognised ablatives in the formations in *thrô*, *tarô*, so we find in this comparative suffix, also, a remnant of the Sanskrit locative; in which, however, as in the adverbs in *th*, *d*, the expression of repose in a place is changed into that of motion to a place—in *hidrê*,* "hither," Mark xi. 3. Luke xiv. 21.; *hva-drê*, "whither?" John vii. 35. On the other hand, *yaindrê* actually occurs with a locative meaning; *tharei leik, yaindrê galisand sik arans*, 'ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί.' Compare these forms with the Sanskṛit, as, *adharê*, "in the lower," and the Lithuanian *wilké* (§. 197.). That, however, the Gothic *ê*, which in the genitive plural masculine and neuter answers to the Sanskṛit आ *â* (§. 69.), moreover corresponds to ए *ê*, is proved by preterites like *nêmum*, 'we took,' answering to the singular *nam*; as, in Sanskṛit, नेमिम *nêmima*, 'we bent ourselves,' answers to ननम *nanama* or ननाम *nanâma*, 'I bent myself.'"

---

* Vide §. 991.

295. The superlative suffix तम *tama* occurs in the Gothic also in the form of *TUMAN*, nominative *tuma*, or, with *d* for *t* in prepositional derivations, either simply or in combination with the common superlative suffix *ISTA*; thus, *af-tuma*, "*posterus*," *af-tumists*, "*postremus*," *hin-dumists*, "*extremus*." If one considers the Indian suffix तम *tama*, to have suffered apocope of the *a*—as in Latin, also, *timus* appears abbreviated to *tim* in adverbs like *viri-tim, caterva-tim*, which I have already, in another place (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818. p. 480), explained, together with forms like *legi-timus*, as superlatives—one may look for that *tam* in the Gothic corrupted to *tana*, after the analogy of the accusative masculine of pronouns, like *tha-na* = तम् *tam*, τόν, *hva-na* = कम् *ka-m*, "whom?"; and accordingly regard the prepositional derivations in *tana, dana*, as superlative forms; thus, Gothic *af-tana*, "behind"; *hindana*, πέραν, Old High German *ni-dana*, "under" (compare our *hie-nieden*, "here below." As, however, in Old High German there exist, also, formations in *ana* without a preceding *t* sound (Grimm III. 203, &c.), it is a question whether *innana* "within," *ûzana* "abroad," *forana* shortened to *forna* "from the beginning," *fërrana* "πόῤῥωθεν," *rûmana* "from a distance," *hôhana* "ὑψόθεν," *heimina* "οἴκοθεν," have lost a *t* or a *d* preceding the *a*; or if they are formed after those in *tana, dana*, in the notion that the whole of the suffix consists merely of *ana*; or, finally, whether they rest on some other principle.

[G. Ed. p. 403.]

The preposition *obar*, "over," Gothic *ufar*, which answers to the Sanskṛit उपरि *upari*, Greek ὑπέρ, has, in the same manner, an adverb *obana*, "above," corresponding to it.

296. In the Sanskṛit the appellations of the quarters of the heavens come from prepositions in combination with the root अञ्च् *anch*, "to go"; thus the east is denoted as "that which is before," by प्राञ्च् *prânch*, from प्र *pra*, "before"; the west as "that which is over against it," by प्रत्यञ्च् *pratyanch*, from प्रति *prati*, "opposite"; the south as "that below," by अवाञ्च् *avânch*, from अव *ava*, "below"; and its opposite pole, the north, as "that above," is called उदञ्च् *udanch*, from उत् *ut*, "up." Now it is remarkable that in German the names of the quarters of the world shew themselves through their terminations, Old High German *tar* and *tana*, or as they so frequently occur in prepositions, *dar*, *dana*, to be derivations from prepositions, though the nature of their origin has become obscure. The custom of the language disposes of the forms in *r* and *na* in such a manner, that the former expresses the direction whither (Grimm. III. 205.), the latter the direction whence, which, however, was not, perhaps, the original intention of the terminations, both which seem adapted to express the same direction; the former comparatively, with a glance at [G. Ed. p. 404.] that which is opposite, the latter superlatively, in relation to all the quarters of the globe, as, p. 376, एकतर *êkatara*, "one of two persons," but एकतम *êkatama*, "one of many persons." The west may perhaps be most satisfactorily explained, and in fact, as being etymologically pointed out to be that which lies over against the east, as in Sanskṛit. For this object we betake ourselves to the prepositional base *wi*, mentioned at p. 382, whence the comparative *wi-dar*. We do not, however, require to deduce *wës-tar*,*

---

* By writing *wë*, Grimm marks the corruption of the *e* from *i*, in which I readily agree with him.

"towards the west," *wës-tana,*" from the west," from the derivative *widar*; but we may keep to its base *wi*, with the assumption of a euphonic *s*; as in the Sanskṛit, also, some prepositions terminating in vowels in certain combinations, and before consonants which are disposed to have an *s* before them, assume this letter; *e. g. pratiṣhkaśa* for *pratikaśu;* and as in Latin *abs, os* (for *obs*), from *ab, ob* (§. 96.). But if it were preferred to deduce *wëstar, wëstana,* from the derivative *widar,* it would then be necessary to force the *d* of derivation into the base, and, according to §. 102., change it into *s.* The east is more difficult of explanation than the west —Old High German *ôs-tar,* "towards the east," *ôs-tana,* "from the east,"—for several prepositions start up together that would gladly sustain this quarter of the heavens. It is not necessary that the preposition after which the east is named should elsewhere, also, be received as a German preposition; for in this appellation a preposition might have incorporated itself, which, except in this case, is foreign to the practice of the German language.

[G. Ed. p. 405.] It may therefore be allowable for us, first of all, to turn to a preposition which, in the Indian language, is prefixed to the south, and, in the German, may have changed its position to the east; the more so, as, with prepositions, the principal point is always where one stands, and the direction to which one is turned; and one may, with perfect justice, turn that which is at the bottom to the uppermost, or to the front. In Zend, *ava,* which in Sanskṛit signifies "below," exists as a pronoun, and means "this"; and as this pronoun is also proper to the Sclavonic (*OVO,* nom. *ov*), and occurs in Greek as *αὐ,* (*αὖ-θι, αὐτός,* see p. 387), it need not surprise us to find an obsolete remnant of this base in German, and that the east is taken as the side opposed to the west. Here it may be necessary to observe, that in Sanskṛit the preposition *ava,* in like manner, annexes a euphonic *s*; from *avas*, therefore, by suppressing the last *a* but one, would arise (as in Greek *αὖ*) *aus* (different from our *aus*, Old High German *ûz*, Gothic *ût*, in Sanskrit उत् *ut*, "up"), and hence, according to §. 80., *ôs*: the old northern form is *austr*, *austan*. The Latin *aus-ter* might then—to which Grimm has already alluded (Wiener Jahrb. B. 28. p. 32)—be placed with more confidence beside the Old High German as a sister form, and led back by the hand of our comparative suffix to the preposition, which in Sanskṛit has given its name to the south, bold as it at the first glance might appear, if we declared *aus-ter* and अवाञ्च् *avânch* (*ava* + *anch*), "southern," to be related. The derivations from *haurio*, or *αὔω*, certainly deserve less notice. As, however, the juxta-position of *austar* with the Latin *auster* and the Indian preposition *ava*, *avas*, is most suitable, we refrain from giving other prepositional modes in which one might arrive at the appellation of the east in German. As the most natural point of departure, we cannot place it in so subordinate a position to the west as to mark it out as "not west" (*a-ustar* from *a-* [G. Ed. p. 406.] *-wĕstar*). We turn now to the south, in Old High German *sun-dar*, "towards the south," *sundana*, "from the south," the connection of which with the *sundrô*, *sundar*, mentioned at p. 383, is not to be mistaken. The south, therefore, appeared to our ancestors as the remote distance, and the reason for the appellation of this quarter of the heavens being clearly in allusion to space, is a new guarantee for the prepositional derivation of the names for east and west, as also for the fact that the designation of the north, too, has subjected itself to a preposition, although it is still more veiled in obscurity than that of the three sister appellations. We cannot, however, omit calling attention to the Sanskṛit preposition निस् *nis*, which signifies "out, without," and before sonant letters, to which *d* belongs (§. 25.) according to a universal law of euphony, appears in the form of *nir*, which it is also usual to represent as the original form.

297. In the Old Sclavonic the Indo-Greek comparative suffix occurs in *vtoryi*, "the second" (m.), in which the definitive pronoun is contained (p. 352): *vtory-i*, then, is formed from *vtoro-i* (§. 255. *d.*), in which the cardinal number *dwa* is melted down to *v*, corresponding in this respect to the Zend *b* in *b-yarĕ*, "two years," but singular, with *b* as a hardened form from *v*. To the Sanskṛit कतर *katara*, "which of two? m." (Gothic *hva-thar*) and यतर *ya-tara*, "which of both," corresponds etymologically, the Old Sclavonic *ko-tory-i* (as definitive), older *ko-tery-i* and *ye-ter*, feminine *ye-tera* (*yε-τερα*), neuter *ye-tero*. The origin of these two pronouns is, however, forgotten, together with their comparative meaning; for *kotoryi* means "who?" and *yeter*, "some one" (compare p. 352). Dobrowsky (p. 343), however, in which he is [G. Ed. p. 407.] clearly wrong, divides the suffix into *ot-or;* for although the interrogative base *KO* may lay aside its *o*, and combine with the demonstrative base *to* (*kto*, "*quis?*" Dobr. p. 342), still it is more in accordance with the history of language to divide *ko-toryi* than *kot-oryi* or *koto-ryi*, as the formation *or* would there stand quite isolated; and besides this the pronoun *i*, "he," from *yo*, does not occur in combination with the demonstrative base *to*, and yet *ye-ter* is said.

298. A small number of comparatives are formed in Sanskṛit by ईयस् *íyas*, and the corresponding superlative by इष्ठ *ishṭha*, in which *ishṭha*, as has been already remarked (p. 389.), we recognise a derivation from *íyas* in its contraction to *ish* (compare *ish-ṭa*, "offered," from *yaj*), so that the suffix of the highest degree is properly थ *tha*, through which, also, the ordinal numbers चतुर्थस् *chatur-thas* (*τέταρ-το-ς*), and षष्ठस् *shash-ṭhas* (*ἕκ-τος*), are formed, for the notion of the superlative lies very close to the ordinal

numbers above two, as that of order does to the superlatives, and hence the suffix तम *tama* occurs in ordinal numbers; *e.g.* विंशतितमस् *vinśati-tama-s*, "the twentieth," wherefore *ma*, in forms like पञ्चमस् *pancha-ma-s*, "the fifth," may be held to be an abbreviation of *tama*. To the form *iṣh*, contracted from *îyas*—euphonic for *is*—in Greek and Zend *is*, corresponds the Latin *is*, in the superlatives in *is-simus*, which I deduce through assimilation from *is-timus* (comp. §. 101.); the simple *is*, however, which, viewed from Latin, is a contraction of *iōs* (§. 22.), appears in the simple form in the adverb *mag-is*, which may be compared with *μεγις* in *μέγισ-τος*. In the strong cases (§. 129.) the Indian comparative shews a broader form than the *îyas* above, namely, a long *â* and a nasal preceding the *s*, thus ईयांस् *îyâns* (see §. 9.), This form, how- [G. Ed. p. 408.] ever, may originally have been current in all the cases, as the strong form in general (§. 129.), as is probable through the pervading long *ō* in Latin, *iōris*, *iōri*, &c., if one would not rather regard the length of the Latin *o* as compensation for the rejected nasal: compare the old accusative *mel-iōsem*, mentioned in §. 22., with Sanskṛit forms like गरीयांसम् *gar-îyâns-am* (*graviorem*). The breadth of the suffix, which is still remarkable in the more contracted from *îyas*, may be the cause why the form of the positive is exposed to great reductions before it; so that not only final vowels are rejected, as generally before Taḍdhita suffixes* beginning with a vowel, but whole suffixes, together with the vowel preceding them, are suppressed (Gramm. Crit. §. 252.); *e. g.* from मतिमत् *mati-mat*, "intelligent," from *mati*, "understanding," comes *mat'-îyâs*; from *balâvat*, "strong" ("gifted with strength," from *bala+vat*), *bal-îyas;* from *kṣhipra,* "quick" (from the base *kṣhip,* "to throw"), comes *kṣhêp-îyas;* from *kṣhudra,* "insignificant," *kṣhêd-îyas;* from *ṭripra,* "satisfied," *trap-îyas;* since with vowels capable of Guna the dropping of the suffix is compensated by strengthening the radical syllable by Guna, as in the Zend *vaêdista;* which Burnouf (Vahista, p. 22) deduces, as it appears to me, with equal correctness and acuteness from *vîdvas* (*vîdvô,* §. 56^b., Sanskṛit *vidwas*), "knowing." With respect to *trapîyas,* from *ṭripra,* let it be observed that *ar,* as Guna of *ri,* is easily transposed to *ra* (Gramm. Crit. §. 34^b.): compare the Greek ἔδρακον for ἔδαρκον; πατράσι for παταρσι (see p. 290, G. ed.). In a similar manner M. Ag. Benary explains the connection of *varîyas* with *uru* "great," with which he rightly compares the Greek εὐρύς (Berl. Jahrb. 1834. I. [G. Ed. p. 409.] pp. 230, 231). But *varîyas* might also come from *vara,* "excellent," and *uru* might be an abbreviation of *varu,* which easily runs into one. To the superlative वरिष्ठ *variṣhṭha,* which does not only mean *latissimus* but also *optimus,* the Greek ἄριστος (therefore Ϝάριστος) is without doubt akin, the connection of which with εὐρύς one could scarcely have conjectured without the Sanskṛit. Remarkable, too, is the concurrence of the Greek with the Sanskṛit in this point, that the former, like the latter, before the gradation suffix under discussion, disburthens itself of other more weighty suffixes (compare Burnouf's Vahista, p. 28); thus, ἔχθιστος, αἴσχιστος, οἴκτιστος, κύδιστος, μήκιστος, ἄλγιστος, from ἔχθρος, &c., exactly as above *kṣhêpiṣhṭhas* and others from *kṣhipra;* and I believe I can hence explain, according to the same principle, the lengthening of the vowel in μήκιστος, μᾶσσον, from μακρός, on which principle also rests the Guna in analogous Sanskṛit forms—namely, as a compensation for the suppression of the suffix. The case is the same with the lengthened vowel in forms like θᾶσσον, ἆσσον, where Buttmann (§. 67. Rem. 3. N. **) assumes that the comparative *ι* has fallen back and united itself with the *α* (*ᾳ*); while, in my opinion, a different account is to be given of what has become of the *ι* in forms like *θάσσων*, *βράσσων* (§. 300.). The formation of *μέγιστος* from *μέγας*, from *μέγαλο-ς*, is similar to the origin, in Sanskṛit, of **बंहिष्ठ** *baṅhiṣhṭha*, from *bahula*, "much"; from *bahu*, "much" comes *bhûyiṣhṭha*; and *μέγ-ιστος*, in relation to ΜΕΓΑΛΟ, has lost as much as *baṅh-iṣhṭha*, compared with *bahula*, only that the Sanskṛit positive base is compensated for the loss of *ula* by the addition of a nasal; which therefore, as Ag. Benary (l. c.) has very correctly remarked, rests on the same principle with the Guna in *kṣhêpiṣhṭha*, &c.*

---

* The Taddhita suffixes are those which form derivative words not primitives direct from the root itself.

"Remark.—It will then, also, be necessary [G. Ed. p. 410.] —as Burnouf (Yaçna, p. 131) first pointed out, but afterwards (Vahista, p. 25), in my opinion, wrongly retracted—to explain the **ए** *ê* of *śrêyas*, "better," *śrêṣhṭha*, "the best," as coming from the *i* of *śrî*, "fortune," by Guna, instead of the common view, in which I formerly concurred, of substituting a useless *śra* as positive, and hence, by contraction with *îyas*, *iṣhṭha*, forming *śrêyas*, *śrêṣhṭha*. From *śrî* comes the derivative *śrîmat*, "fortunate," from which I deduce *śrê-yas*, *śrê-ṣhṭha*, by the prescribed removal of the suffix,† although one might expect in the superlative *śray-iṣhṭha*, euphonic for *śrê-iṣhṭha*; and on this ground it is that Burnouf takes his objection. But as in Greek *ἕκα-στος, ὁπό-στος* (see p. 376), in spite of the want of the *ι* of *ιστος*, are nevertheless nothing else than superlative forms, I do not see why, in certain cases, in Sanskṛit, also, the suppression of an *i* may not hold good. This happens, moreover, in *sthê-ṣhṭha* from *sthi-ra*, "fast," *sphê-ṣhṭha* from *sphi-ra*, "swollen," and *prê-ṣhṭha* from *priy-a*, "dear." In the latter case, after removing the suffix *a*, the preceding *y*, also, must retire, since *priy* is only a euphonic alteration of *prî* (Gramm. Crit. §. 51.) As to the derivation, however, of the meanings *melior, optimus*, from a positive with the meaning "fortunate," it may be further remarked, that, in Sanskṛit, "fortune" and "splendour" are generally the fundamental notions for that which is good and excellent; hence, *bhagavat*, "the honourable," "the [G. Ed. p. 411.] excellent," properly, "the man gifted with fortune"; for our *besserer, bester*, also Gothic *bat-iza, bat-ists*, are associated with a Sanskṛit root denoting fortune (*bhad*, whence *bhadra*, "fortunate," "excellent"), which Pott was acute enough first to remark (Etymol. Inquiries, p. 245), who collates also *bôtyan*, "to use." The old *d* gives, according to §. 87., in the Gothic *t*, and the Sanskṛit *bh* becomes *b*. It might appear too daring if we made an attempt to refer *melior* also to this root; but cognate words often assume the most estranged form through doubled transitions of sound, which, although doubled, are usual. It is very common for *d* to become *l* (§. 17.), and also between labial medials and the nasal of this organ there prevails no unfrequent exchange (comp. §. 63.). If, also, the Greek *βελτίων, βέλτιστος*, should belong to this class, and the *τ* be an unorganic addition, which is wanting in *βέλ-τερος, βέλ-τατος*, *βελ* would then give the middle step between भद् *bhad* and *mel*. The ideal positive of *βελτίων*, namely *ἀγαθός*, might be connected with अगाध *agâdha*, "deep," with which, also, the Gothic *gôths* (theme

---

* The Guna, however, in the gradation forms under discussion, might also be accounted for in a different way, namely, by bringing it into connection with the Vṛiddhi, which occurs before many other Taddhita suffixes, especially in patronymics, as **वैवस्वत** *vaivaswata*, from **विवस्वत्** *vivaswat*. On account of the great weight of the gradation suffixes *îyas*, *iṣhṭha*, which has given rise to the suppression of the suffix of the positive base, the initial vowel also of the same would accordingly be raised by the weaker Guna, instead of by the Vṛiddhi, as usual (§. 26.). Be that how it may, one must in any case have ground to assume an historic connection between the Grecian vowel-lengthening in *μήκιστος*, *θᾶσσον*, and others, and that of Sanskṛit forms like *kshêpîyas*, *kshêpiṣhtha*.

† If there existed, as in Zend, a *śrîra*, one might hence also derive the above gradations.

gôda) is to be compared, with *ô*, according to rule, for आ *â* (§. 69.), and medials for Greek aspirates, according to §. 87.

299. From the strong theme ईयांस् *îyâṅs*, mentioned at §. 298., comes the nominative *îyân*, with the suppression of the final letter rendered necessary through §. 94. The vocative has a short *a*, and sounds *îyan*. To *îyan* answers the Greek *ῑων*, and to the vocative *îyan* answers *ῑον*; to the neuter *îyas* (N. A. V.), identical with the weak theme, corresponds the Latin *ius* (§. 22.). The Greek, however, cannot become repossessed of the *s*, which is abandoned in Sanskṛit in the nominative and vocative masculine for legitimate reasons, since it declines its comparative as though its theme terminated from the first with *ν*; hence accusative *ῑον-α* for the Sanskṛit ईयांसम् *îyâṅs-am*, Latin *iōr-em* (*iōs-em*, §. 22.), genitive *ῑον-ος* for *îyas-as*, *iōr-is*. However, one might, as Pott has already, I believe, noticed somewhere, reduce the contracted forms like *βελτίω*, *βελτίους*, to an original *ῑοσα*, *ῑοσες*, *ῑοσας*, corresponding to *îyâṅsam*, *îyâṅsi* (neuter plural), *îyâṅs-as*, *îyas-as*, the *σ* of which, as is so common between two vowels, would be rejected.* On the other hand, *ν*, except in [G. Ed. p. 412.] comparatives, on the presupposition that the contracted forms have rejected an *ν* and not *σ*, is suppressed only in a few isolated words (Ἀπόλλω, Ποσειδῶ, *εἰκώ*, *ἀηδοῦς*, and a few others), which, however, the theoretic derivation of the comparative Σ renders very embarrasing. We would therefore prefer giving up this, and assuming, that while the Sanskṛit in the weak, *i.e.* in the majority of cases, has abandoned the former consonant of *ṅs*, the Greek, which was still less favourable to the *νσ*-, has given up the latter, as perhaps one may suppose in the oldest, as it were, pre-Grecian period, forms like *βελτιονσα*. It is, however, remarkable, that while all other European sister lan-

---

* Comp. p. 325 G. ed.

guages have only preserved the last element of the comparative *ns*—the Latin in the form of *r*—and while the Sanskṛit also shews more indulgence for the *s* than for the *n*, the Greek alone has preserved the nasal; so that in the comparative it differs in this respect from all the other languages. Without the intervention of the Sanskṛit and Zend it would be hardly possible to adduce from the European sister languages a cognate termination to the Greek *ῑων*, *ῑον*; or if *iōr* and *ῑων* should be compared, one would think rather of a permutation of liquids,* than that after the Greek *ν* the prototype of the Latin *r*, namely *σ*, has originally existed.

300. In Zend, the superlatives in 𐬌𐬯𐬙𐬀 *ista* are more numerous than the corresponding ones in Sanskṛit, and require no authentication. With regard to their theory, Burnouf has rendered important service, by his excellent [G. Ed. p. 413.] treatise on the Vahista; and his remarks are also useful to us in Sanskṛit Grammar. In form 𐬌𐬯𐬙𐬀 *ista* stands nearer to the Greek *ιστο-ς* than the Indian *iṣhtha*, and is completely identical with the Gothic *ista*, nom, *ist'-s* (§. 135.), as the Zend frequently exhibits *t* for the Sanskṛit aspirates. The comparative form which belongs to *ista* is much more rare, but perhaps only on account of the want of occasion for its appearance in the authorities which have been handed down to us, in which, also, the form in *tara* can only scantily be cited. An example of the comparative under discussion is the feminine 𐬨𐬀𐬳𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬵𐬍 *maśyêhî*, which occurs repeatedly, and to which I have already elsewhere drawn attention.† It springs from the positive base

---

* Comp. §. 20.

† Berl. Jahrb. 1831. I. p. 372. I then conceived this form to be thus arrived at, that the *y* of the Sanskṛit *îyasî* had disappeared, as in the genitive termination *hê*, from स्य *sya*; after which the *î* must have passed into *y*. Still the above view of the case, which is also the one chosen by Burnouf, is

𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬱 *maśaś*, "great" (*maśô*, *maśah*, *maśaṇh*, §§. 56ᵃ. 56ᵇ.), and confirms, like other Zend forms, the theory which holds good for the Sanskṛit, that other suffixes fall away before the exponents of the comparative and superlative relation under discussion. If *yêhî* is compared with the Sanskṛit feminine base *îyasî*, the loss of the *î* shews itself, and then the *a* has, through the power of assimilation of the *y* (§. 42.), become *ê*, and *s* has, according to §. 53., become *h*. In the loss of the *î* the Zend coincides with the Sanskṛit forms like *śrê-yas*, mentioned at p. 397, with which, also, *bhû-yas*, "more," and *jyâ-yas*, "older," agree. Greek comparatives with a doubled *σ* before *ων*, as *κρείσσων*, *βράσσων*, *ἐλάσσων*, are based on this; which, according to a law of euphony very universally followed in Prâkṛit, have assimilated the *y* to the preceding consonant, as elsewhere *ἄλλος* [G. Ed. p. 414.] from *ἀλyος*, Gothic *alya-*, Latin *aliu-s*, Sanskṛit *anya*, are explained (Demonstrative Bases, p. 20). In Prâkṛit, in the assimilations which are extremely common in this dialect, the weaker consonant assimilates itself to the stronger, whether this precedes or follows it; thus *aṇṇa*, "the other," from *anya*, corresponds to the Greek *ἄλλος*; the Sanskṛit *tasya*, "*hujus*," becomes *tassa*; *bhavishyati*, "he will be," becomes *bhavissadi*,* *divya*, "heavenly," *divva*; from

---

is simpler, and closer at hand, although the other cannot be shewn to be impossible; for it is certain that if the *y* of *îyas* had disappeared in Zend, it would fall to the turn of the preceding *î* to become *y*.

* Comp. *ἔσσομαι*, from *ἐσyομαι*, with स्यामि *syâmi*, in composition with attributive verbs. It may be allowed here preliminarily to mention another interesting Prâkṛit form of the future, which consists in this, that the Sanskṛit *s* passes into *h*, but the syllable य *ya* is contracted to *i*, herein agreeing with the Latin *i* in *eris*, *erit*, *amabis*, *amabit*, &c.; as, *karîhisi*, "thou willst make," from *karishyasi*; *sahîhimi*, "I will endure," from *sahishyâmi*, instead of the medial form *sahishyê* (Urvasi, by Lenz. p. 59).

which it is clear that *v* is stronger than *y*, as it also is more powerful than *r*; hence *savva* from *sarva*, "everyone." It is remarkable that the *i* also of *iti* "thus" assimilates itself to the following *t*; hence, *tti*, which, in pronunciation, naturally leans upon the word preceding. Therefore one might thus also, without presupposition of a form *yων*, establish the assimilation from *ιων*. As to the transition of the consonant of the positive base into σ (*κρέισ-σων, βράσ-σων, βάσ-σων, μάσ-σων, ἐλάσ-σων*, &c.), to which the *y* has assimilated, the transition of *τ, δ, θ*, into *σ* need least of all surprise us (see §. 99.); but with regard to the gutturals, the Old Sclavonic may be noticed, in which, besides what has been remarked in §. 255. (*m.*), *y*, *i*, and *e*—which latter comes very near the vowel combined with a *y*, and is frequently the remainder of the syllable *ye*—exert an influence on a guttural preceding them, similar [G. Ed. p. 415.] to that which the comparative *y* or *ι* produces in Greek. Before the *i*, namely, of the nominative plural, and before *ye* in the dative and locative singular, as before *i* and *ye* of the imperative, *ch* becomes *s*; *e.g. gryes-i* from *gryech*, as *θάσ-σων* from *θάσ-yων*, from *ταχ-*; *g* becomes *ζ*, *e.g. prûζi* from *prûg*, as *μείζων, ὀλίζων*, from *μειζyων, ὀλιζyων*, from *μεγ-, ὀλιγ-*; *k* becomes *ch*, while in Greek *κ* is modified in the same way as *χ* On account of the contracted nature of the *ζ* (= *δσ*) no assimilation takes place after it, but the *y* entirely disappears, or, in *μείζων*, is pressed into the interior of the word (comp. §. 119.), as in *ἀμείνων, χείρωι'*, which latter may be akin to the Sanskrit अधर *adhara*, "the under (m)," consequently with aphæresis of the *a* (comp. §. 401.). With the superlative *μέγιστος* compare the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬀 *mazista*, where 𐬰 *z*, according to §. 57., answers to the Sanskrit *h* of महत् *mahat*, "great"; while in the above 𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬵𐬍 *maśyêhî*, as in the positive *maśaś* (euphonically *maśô*), *ś* stands irregularly for *z*, as if the Zend, by its permutation of consonants in this word, would vie with the Greek; but we find, Vend. S. p. 214, 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬌𐬌𐬋 *mazyô*, with *z*, which I hold to be a neuter comparative; thus, 𐬨𐬀𐬰𐬌𐬌𐬋 𐬬𐬍𐬛𐬬𐬃 *mazyô vîdvâo*, "the more (literally greater) wise."

301. As in the Latin comparative a suffix has raised itself to universal currency, which in Sanskṛit and Greek is only sparingly applied, but was, perhaps, originally, similarly with the form in *tara*, *τερο-ς*, in universal use; so the German, the Sclavonic, and Lithuanian, in their degrees of comparison everywhere attach themselves to the more rare forms in Sanskṛit and Greek; and indeed in the Gothic the suffix of the comparative shews itself in the same shortened form in which it appears in the Sanskṛit, Zend, Greek, and Latin, in its combination with the superlative suffix (see §. 298. p. 395 &c.), namely, as *is;* and this most plainly in adverbs like *mais*, "more," whose con- [G. Ed. p. 416.] nection with comparatives in the Sanskṛit, &c., I first pointed out in the Berl. Jahrb. (May 1827, p. 742). We must divide, therefore, thus, *ma-is*; and this word, as well in the base as in the termination, is identical with the Latin *mag-is* (comp. *μέγισ-τος*, p. 402); whence it is clear that the Gothic form has lost a guttural (compare *ma-jor* and *mag-ior*), which, in *mikils*, "great"—which has weakened the old *a* to *i*—appears, according to the rule for the removal of letters (§. 87.), as *k*. *Mais*, therefore, far as it seems to be separated from it, is, in base and formation, related to the Zend *maz-yô* (from *maz-yaś*), which we have become acquainted with above (p. 415 G. ed.) in the sense of "more."

"Remark.—There are some other comparative adverbs in *is*, of which, the first time I treated of this subject, I was not in possession, and which Grimm has since (III. 589, &c.) represented as analogous to *mais*. He has however, afterwards, l. c. p. 88, agreed, with Fulda, in viewing *hauhis*, *ἀνώτερον*, as the genitive of the positive *hauhs*, "high." Yet *hauhis* stands in exactly the same relation to *hauhiza*, "the higher," that *mais* does to *maiza*, "major."

Compared with the Zend *maz-yô* and Greek *μείζ-ων*, one might believe the *z* in *maiza* belonged to the positive base, particularly as the Old High German adds a second comparative suffix to its adverb *mêr*, answering to the Gothic *mais* (*mêriro*, '*major*') because in *mêr* no formal expression of the comparative relation was any longer felt. *Raihtis*, which Grimm wishes to leave under the forms which, III. p. 88, are considered as genitive, seems to me properly to signify *potius*, or our *rechter*; and I consider it, therefore, as a comparative, although the Old High German *rëhtes*, examined from the point of view of the Old High German, can only be a genitive, and the comparative adverb is *rëhtôr*. The comparative *ga-raihtôza*, '*justior*,' which may be cited in Gothic, does not prevent the assumption that there may have been also in use a *raihtiza*, as in all adjectives *iza* may just as well be expected as *ôza*; for, together with the comparative adverb *frumôzô*, 'at first' (R. xi. 35), occurs the superlative *frumists*. Perhaps, however, the genius of the Old High German language has allowed itself to be deceived through the identity of the comparative suffix *is* with the genitive termination *i-s*; and taking some obsolete comparatives, which have been transmitted to it [G. Ed. p. 417.] for genitives, left them the *s*, which, in evident comparatives, must pass into *r*; but is also still retained as *s* in *wirs*, '*pejus*.' I prefer to consider, also, *allis*, '*omnino*,' as a comparative, in order entirely to exclude the Gothic apparent genitive adverbs from the class of adjectives. In the Old High German, together with *alles*, '*omnino*,' exists *alles*, '*aliter*,' which, according to its origin, is an essentially different word—through assimilation from *alyes*, as above (p. 414 G. ed.) ἄλλος—in which the comparative termination, in the Latin *ali-ter* and similar adverbs, is to be observed. The probability that these forms, which, to use the expression, are clothed as genitives, are, by their origin, comparatives, is still further increased thereby, that together with *eines*, '*semel*,' and *anderes*, '*aliter*,' there occur, also, forms in the guise of superlatives, namely, *einest*, 'once' (see Graff, p. 329), and *anderest*, 'again.' Some comparative adverbs of this sort omit, in Gothic, the *i* of *is*; thus *min-s*, 'less' (compare *minor*, *minus*, for *minior*, *minius*), perhaps *vair-s*, 'worse,' which is raised anew into *vairsiza*, '*pejor*,' and may be connected with the Sanskṛit *avara*, '*posterus*,' as above χείρων was compared with अधर *adhara*; *seith-s*, '*amplius*' (from *seithu*, 'late'); and probably, also, *suns*, '*statim*,' and *anaks*, '*subito*.'"

302. The comparative-suffix *is* required in Gothic, where the consonant *s* is no longer capable of declension,* an unorganic addition, or otherwise the sibilant would have been necessarily suppressed. The language, however, preserved this letter, as its meaning was still too powerfully perceived, by the favourite addition *an*, which we have seen above, though without the same urgent necessity, joined to participial bases in *nd* in their adjective state (§. 289.). As, then, *s* comes to be inserted between two [G. Ed. p. 418.] vowels, it must, by §. 86. (5.), be changed into *z*: hence the modern theme *MAIZAN*, from the original *MAIS*, which has remained unaltered in the adverb. The nominative masculine and neuter are, according to §§. 140. 141., *maiza*, *maizô*. On the other hand the feminine base does not develope itself from the masculine and neuter base *MAIZAN*—as in general from the unorganic bases in *an* of the indefinite adjectives

---

* A base in *s*, as the abovementioned *mais*, would not be distinguished from the theme in all the cases of the singular, as also in the nominative and accusative plural, as, of final double *s*, the latter must be rejected (comp. *drus*, "fall," for *drus-s* from *drusa-s*, §. 292. 1st Note). In the nominative and genitive singular, therefore, the form *mais-s* must have become *mais*; just as, in the nominative and accusative plural, where *ahman-s* comes from the theme *ahman*. The dative singular is, in bases ending in a consonant, without exception devoid of inflection ; and so is the accusative, in substantives of every kind.

no feminines arise—but to the original feminine base in *î*, which exists in the Sanskṛit and Zend, an *n* is added, as in the participle present; thus *MAIZEIN* (*ei* = *î*, §. 70.), from *mais* + *ein*, answers to the Zend feminine base of the same import, 𐬨𐬀𐬳𐬫𐬉𐬵𐬍 *maśyêhî*, and Sanskṛit forms like गरीयसी *garîyas-î*, from *garîyas*. The nominative *maizei* may then, according to §. 142., be deduced from *MAIZEIN*, or may be viewed as a continuation of the form in Zend and Sanskṛit which, in the nominative, is identical with the theme (§. 137.); in which respect again the participle present (§. 290.) is to be compared. These two kinds of feminines, namely, of the said participle and the comparative, stand in Gothic very isolated; but the ground of their peculiarity, which Jacob Grimm, III. 566, calls still undiscovered (compare I. 756), appears to me, through what has been said, to be completely disclosed; and I have already declared my opinion [G. Ed. p. 419.] in this sense before.* The Old High German has brought its feminine comparatives into the more usual path, and gives, as corresponding to the Gothic *minnizei*, "the lesser" (fem.), not *minnirî*, but *minnira*. The Gothic sibilant, however, was, in the High German comparatives, in the earliest period transmuted into *r*, whence, in this respect, *minniro, minnira*, has more resemblance to the Latin *minor* than to the Gothic *minniza, minnizei*.

---

* Berl. Jahrb. May 1827, p. 743, &c. Perhaps Grimm had not yet, in the passage quoted above, become acquainted with my review of the two first parts of his Grammar; since he afterwards (II. 650.) agrees with my view of the matter. I find, however, the comparison of the transition of the Gothic *s* into *z* with that of the Indian स् *s* into ष् *ṣh* inadmissible, as the two transitions rest upon euphonic laws which are entirely distinct; of which the one, which obtains in the Gothic (§. 86. 5.), is just as foreign to the Sanskṛit, as the Sanskṛit (§. 21. and Gramm. Crit. 101^a.) is to the Gothic. It is further to be observed, that, on account of the difference of these laws, the Sanskṛit ष् *ṣh* remains also in the superlative, where the Gothic has always *st*, not *zt*. In respect to Greek, it may here be further remarked, that Grimm, l. c. p. 651, in that language, also, admits an original *s* in the comparative; which he, however, does not look for after the ν of ιων, as appears from §. 299., but before it; so that he wishes to divide thus μεί-ζων, as an abbreviation of μεγίζων; and regards the ζ not as a corruption of the γ, as Buttmann also assumes, but as a comparative character, as in the kindred Gothic *ma-iza*. The Greek ων, ον, would, according to this, appear identical with the unorganic Gothic *an* in *MAIZAN*; while we have assigned it, in §. 299., a legitimate foundation, by tracing it back to the Sanskṛit *âṅs*.

303. The comparative suffix in the Gothic, besides *is, iz-an*, exhibits also the form *ôs, ôz-an*: it is, however, more rare; but in the Old High German has become so current, that there are more comparatives in it in *ôro* (nominative masculine), *ôra* (nominative feminine and neuter), than in *iro, ira*, or *ëro, ëra*. The few forms in *ŌZAN* which can be adduced in Gothic are, *svinthôza*, "*fortior*" (nominative masculine), *frôdôza*, "*prudentior*," *frumôza*, "*prior*," *hlasôza*, "*hilarior*," *garaihtôza*, "*justior*," *framaldrôza*, "*provectior ætate*," *usdaudoza*, "*sollicitior*," *unsvikunthôza*, "*inclarior*" (Massmann, p. 47), and the adverbs *sniumundôs*, "σπουδαιοτέρως," and *alỵaleikôs*, "ἑτέρως." How, then, is the *ô* in these forms to be explained, contrasted with the *i* of *IS, IZAN?* I believe only as coming from the long *a* of the Sanskṛit strong themes *îyâṅs* or *yaṅs* (§§. 299. 300.), with *ô*, according to rule, for आ *â* (§. 69.). If one starts from the latter [G. Ed. p. 420.] form, which, in the Zend, is the only one that can be adduced, then, beside the nasal, which is lost also in the Latin and in the weak cases in the Sanskṛit, *yâṅs* has lost in the Gothic either the *â* or the *y* (=*j*), which, when the *â* is suppressed, must be changed into a vowel. The Gothic *ôs, ôz*, and still more the Old High German *ôr*, correspond, therefore, exactly to the Latin *ôr* in *minor, minôr-is*, for *minior*. There is reason to assume that, in the Gothic, originally *ỵ* and *ô* existed in juxta-position to one another; and that for *minniza*, "the lesser," was used *minnỵôza*, and for *frôdôza*, "the more intelligent," *frôdỵôza*.

The forms which have lost the *y* are represented in Latin by *minor*, *minus*, and *plus*, and those with *ô* suppressed by *mag-is*. One cannot, however, in Gothic, properly require any superlatives in *ŌSTA*, nom. *ôst'-s*, corresponding to the comparatives in *ôs*, *ôz*; because this degree in the Sanskṛit, Zend, Greek, and Latin always springs from the form of the comparative, contracted to *is*, *ish*. It is, however, quite regular, that, to the *frumôza*, "*prior*," corresponds a *frumists*, "*primus*," not *frumôsts*. To the remaining comparatives in *ôza* the superlative is not yet adduced; but in the more recent dialects the comparatives have formed superlatives with *ô*, after their fashion; and thus, in the Old High German, *ôst* usually stands in the superlative, where the comparative has *ôr*: the Gothic furnishes two examples of this confusion of the use of language, in *lasivôsts*, "*infirmissimus*" (1 Cor. xii. 22.), and *armôsts*, "*miserrimus*" (1 Cor. xv. 19.).

304. In the rejection of the final vowel of the positive base before the suffixes of intensity the German agrees with the cognate languages; hence *sut'-iza*, from *SUTU**, "sweet"; [G. Ed. p. 421.] *hard'-iza*, from *HARDU*, "hard"; *seith-s* (*thana-seiths*, "*amplius*"), from *SEITHU*, "late"; as in the Greek ἡδίων from ʽΗΔΥ, and in the Sanskṛit *laghîyas* from *laghu*, "light." *Ya* is also rejected; hence *spêd'-iza*, from *SPEDYA*, "late" (see p. 358, Note 7.); *reik'-iza*, from *REIKYA*, "rich." One could not therefore regard the *ô*, in forms like *frôdôza*, as merely a lengthening of the *a* in *FRŌDA* (§. 69.), as it would be completely contrary to the principle of these formations, not only not to suppress the final vowel of the positive base, but even to lengthen it. The explanation of the comparative *ô* given at §. 303, remains therefore the only one that can be relied upon.

---

* The positive does not occur, but the Sanskṛit *swâdu-s* and Greek ἡδύ-ς lead us to expect a final *u*.

305. In the Old Sclavonic, according to Dobrowsky, p. 332, &c., the comparative is formed in three ways, namely,

(1) By masculine *iĭ*, feminine *shi*, neuter *ỵee*; as, *ûniĭ*, "the better (m.)"; *ûnshi*, "the better (f.)"; *ûnỵee*, "the best (n.)," from a positive which has been lost, as *batiza*, *melior*, and *ἀμείνων*; and it is perhaps connected in its base with the latter, so that *α* may have become *o* (§. 255. *a.*), but *μ*, *ŭ*, as frequently occurs with *n*; and this *ŭ*, with the preceding *o*, has become *û* (ȣ).[*] *Mniĭ*, "the lesser, (m.)," fem. *menshi*, neuter *mnỵee*, spring, in like manner, from a positive which has been lost. *Bolii*, "the greater," fem. *bolshi*, neuter *bolỵee*, may be compared with the Sanskṛit *balîyân*, "the stronger" (p. 396), fem. *balîyasî*, neuter *balîyas*.[†] For [G. Ed. p. 422.] *boliĭ* is also used *bolỵeĭ*; and all the remaining comparatives which belong to this class have *ỵeĭ* for *iĭ*, and thus answer better to the neuter form *ỵee*. If, as appears to be the case, the form *ỵeï* is the genuine one, then *ỵe* answers to the Sanskṛit *yas* of *jyâ-yas*, *bhû-yas*, *ṡrê-yas*, &c. (§. 300.), and the loss of the *s* is explained by §. 255. (*l.*): the final *i* of *ỵe-ĭ*, however, is the definitive pronoun (§. 284.), for comparatives always follow, in the masculine and neuter, the definite declension. In the feminine in *shi* it is easy to recognise the Sanskṛit *sî* of *îyas-î*, or *yas-î*, and herewith also the Gothic *zei* (oblique theme *ZEIN*,

---

[*] The *a* in *ἀμείνων* appears to me to be privative; so that *μείνων* would seem to be a sister form to the Latin *minor*, Gothic *minniza*, Sclavonic *mniĭ*; and *ἀμείνων* would properly signify "the not lesser," "the not more trifling." Perhaps this word is also inherent in *omnis*; so that *o* for *a* would be the negation, which, in Latin, appears as *in*; where it may be observed, that, in Sanskṛit, *a-sakṛit*, literally "not once," has taken the representation of the meaning "several times."

[†] The positive *veliĭ*, with *v* for *b* and *e* for *o*, occurs only in this definite form (Dobr. p. 320); the primitive and indefinite form must be *vel*. With respect to the stronger *o* corresponding to the weaker letter *e* (§. 255. *a.*), *boliĭ*, in the positive, answers to the manner in which vowels are strengthened in Sanskṛit, as mentioned at §. 298.

p. 418 G. ed.); that is to say, *bol-shi*, "the greater (fem.)," corresponds to the Sanskṛit बलीयसी *balíyasî*, "the stronger (f.)," and *menshi*, "the lesser," to the Gothic *minn-izei*. While, therefore, the Sclavonic masculine and neuter have lost the *s* of the Sanskṛit *yas*, the feminine has lost the *ya* of *yas-î*.* This feminine *shi*, also, in departure from (2) and (3), keeps free from the definite pronoun. There are some comparative adverbs in *e*, as the abbreviation of *ye* (§. 255. *n.*), which in like manner dispense with the definite pronoun; thus, *ûnê*, "better"; *bole*, "greater"—in Servian MSS. *ûnye, bolye*; [G. Ed. p. 423.] *pache*, "more," probably related to παχύς, πᾶσσων; so that (which is very obscure) the final vowel of *pache* for *pach-ye*, for reasons which have been given before, is, in fact, identical with the Greek *σο* of πᾶσ-σον, for πασ-yον. The *ch* of *pache* may, according to p. 415 G. ed., be regarded as a modification of *k*, as the first σ of πᾶσσον has developed itself from χ. Thus the ζ of *dolζ-yee*, "longer" (neuter and adverbial), as euphonic representative of the *g* of *dolg, dolga, dolgo* (*longus, a, um*), answers remarkably to the Greek ζ in μείζων, ὀλίζων, for μείγων, ὀλίγων. That, however, the positive *dolg* is connected with the Greek δολιχός needs scarce to be mentioned. Somewhat more distant is the Sanskṛit दीर्घस् *dîrgha-s*, of the same meaning, in which the frequently-occurring interchange between *r* and *l* is to be noticed (§. 20.). The *ι* of *δολιχὸς*, however, shews itself, by the evidence of the Sclavonic and Sanskṛit, to be an organic addition. Let *garỵee*, "*pejus*," be compared with the Sanskṛit *garîyas*, "*gravius*," from *guru*, "heavy"—according to Burnouf's correct remark from *garu*, as this adjective is pronounced in Pâli—through the assimilating influence of the final *u*, to which the kindred Greek *βαρὺς* has permitted no euphonic reaction.

---

* It may be proper here to call remembrance to the past gerund, properly a participle, which in the strong cases *vâṅs*, nom. masc. *vân* for *vaṅs*, fem. *ushi*, neuter *vat* (for *vas*), corresponds to the Sanskṛit of the reduplicated preterite in *vas*. The Old Sclavonic has here, in the nominative masculine, where the *s* should stand at the end, lost this letter, according to §. 255. (*l.*), as *by-v*, "*qui fuit*," but *by-vshi*, "*quæ fuit*"; and in the masculine also, in preference to the comparative, the *s* again appears in the oblique cases, because there, in the Sanskṛit, after the *s* follow terminations beginning with a vowel; so in *rek-sh*, "*eum qui dixit*," the *sh* corresponds to the Sanskṛit *vâṅs-am*, as *rurud-vâṅs-am*, "*eum qui ploravit*."

(2) The second, by far the most prevalent form of the Old Sclavonic comparative, is nominative masculine *shiĭ*, feminine *shaỵa*, neuter *shee*. The *i* of *shiĭ* is the definitive pronoun, which, in the feminine, is *ya*, and in the neuter *e* for *ỵe* (§§. 282. 284.). After the loss, then, of this pronoun, there remains *shi, sha, she;* and these are abbreviations of *shỵo, shỵa, shỵe*, as we have seen, p. 332, G. ed., the adjective base *SINỴO* (nominative *siny*), before its union with the defining *i*, contracted to *sini* (*sini-ĭ*, neuter *sine-e* for *sinỵe-ỵe*. The definite feminine of *SINỴO* is *sinỵa-ỵa;* and as to the feminine comparatives not being *shỵa-ỵa* but *sha-ỵa*, this rests on the special ground that sibilants gladly free themselves from a following *ỵ*, especially [G. Ed. p. 424.] before *a* (Dobrowsky, p. 12); so in the feminine nominatives *dûsha, sûsha, chasha*, for *sûsỵa*, &c. (Dobr. p. 279). The relation of the comparative form under discussion to the Sanskṛit यस् *yas* and Zend 𐬫𐬀𐬯 *yaṡ* (p. 401) is therefore to be taken thus, that the *ya* which precedes the sibilant is suppressed, as in the above feminines in *shi;* but for it, at the end, is added an unorganic *ỴO*, which corresponds to the Gothic-Lithuanian *ỴA* in the themes *NIUỴA, NAUỴA*, "new," answering to नव *nava*, *NOVU*, NEO, Sclavonic *NOVO*. This adjunct *ỴO* has preserved the comparative sibilant in the masculine and neuter, which, in the first formation, must yield to the euphonic law, §. 255. (*l.*) Examples of this second formation are, *ûn-shiĭ*, "the better (*m.*)," feminine

ûn-shay̦a, neuter *ûn-shee*; *pûst-shiĭ* from *pûst*, theme *PŪSTO*, "desert." Hence it is clear that the final vowel of the positive base is rejected, as in all the cognate languages, however difficult the combination of the *t* with *sh*. Even whole suffixes are rejected, in accordance with §. 298.; as, *glûb-shiĭ* from *glûbok*, "deep" (definite, *glûboky-ĭ*), *sladshiĭ* from *sladok*, "sweet."*

(3) Masculine *y̦eĭshiĭ*, feminine *y̦eĭshaya*, neuter *y̦eĭshee*; but after *sch*, *sh*, and *ch*, *aĭ* stands for *y̦eĭ*: and this *aĭ* evidently stands only euphonically for *y̦aĭ*, since the said sibilants, as [G. Ed. p. 425.] has been already remarked, gladly divest themselves of a following *y̦*: hence *blasch-aĭshiĭ*, "the better" (masculine), from *blag* (theme *BLAGO*), "good,"† since *g*, through the influence of the *y̦* following, gives way to a sibilant, which has subsequently absorbed the *y̦*; compare *ὀλίζ-ων*, for *ὀλίγ-ίων*, *ὀλιγ-y̦ων* (p. 402): so *tish-aishiĭ*, from *tich* (theme *TICHO*), "still,"‡ as in the Greek *θάσ-σων* from *ταχύς*. As example of the form

---

* I hold *ko*, whence in the nom. masc. *k*, for the suffix of the positive base, but the preceding *o* for the final vowel of the lost primitive; and this *o* corresponds either to a Sanskṛit *a*, according to §. 255. (*a*.), or to an उ *u*, according to §. 255. (*c*.); for example, *tano-k*, "thin," theme *TANOKO*, corresponds to the Sanskṛit *tanu-s*, "thin," Greek *ταvυ*; and *slado-k* to the Sanskṛit *swâdu-s*, "sweet," with exchange of the *v* for *l*, according to §.20. Thus the above *slad-shiĭ* shews itself to be originally identical, as well in the suffix of the positive as of the other degrees with the Greek *ἡδ-ίων* and Gothic *'sut-iza* (§. 304.), far as the external difference may separate them; and to the Sclavonic is due, as to the truer preservation of the fundamental word, the preference above the Greek and Gothic, although, on account of the unexpected transition of the *v* into *l*, the origin of the Sclavonic word is more difficult to recognise.

† Dobrowsky says (p. 334) from *blagy̦i* (this is the definite, see §. 284.): it is, however, evident that the comparative has not arisen from the adjective compounded with a pronoun, but from the simple indefinite one.

‡ Compare the Sanskṛit adverb *tûṣhṇîm*, "still, silent," and refer to §. 255. (*m*.).

with *ỵeĭ*, *ỵûn-ỵeĭshiĭ*, "junior," from *ỵûn*, may serve. Whence comes, then, the *ỵeĭ* or *aĭ* (for *ỵaĭ*), which distinguishes this formation from the second? It might be supposed that to the first formation in *ỵeĭ*, where, for example, also *ỵûn-ỵeĭ*, "the younger (m.)," occurs, that of the second has also been added, as in Old High German *mêrero*, "the greater" (masculine), and in Gothic, probably, *vairsiza*, "the worse" (p. 405), are raised twice to the comparative degree; and as, in Persian, the superlatives in *terîn*, in my opinion, contain, as their last element, the comparative ईयांस् *îyâṅs*, which forms, in the nominative masculine, *îyân*, and from this could be easily contracted to *în*. In Persian the comparative is formed through *ter*; as, *behter*, "the better," whence *behterîn*, "the best." Now it deserves remark, that in Old Sclavonic the formation before us frequently occurs with a superlative meaning, while in the more modern dialects the superlative relation is expressed through the comparative with *nai*, "more," prefixed (probably from *maĭ* = Gothic *mais*, according to §. 225. *l.*). The only objection to this mode of explanation [G. Ed. p. 426.] is this, that the element of the first formation *ỵe-ĭ* has not once laid aside the definitive pronoun *i*, which is foreign to the comparative; so that therefore in *ỵûn-ỵeĭ-shiĭ* the said pronoun would be contained twice. There is, however, another way of explaining this *ỵeĭshiĭ* or *(ỵ)aĭshiĭ*, namely, as an exact transmission of the Sanskṛit *îyas* or *yas*, from which the second formation has only preserved the sibilant; but the third, together with this letter, may have retained also that which preceded. Still, even in this method, the *i* of *ỵeĭ*, *(ỵ)aĭ*, is embarrassing, if it be not assumed that it owes its origin to a transposition of the *î* of *îya*.

306. As to the remark made at p. 400, that among the European languages the Greek only has preserved the nasal, which the Sanskṛit shews in the strong cases of the comparative suffix *îyâṅs*, I must here admit a limitation in

favour of the Lithuanian, which, exceeding in this point the Greek, continues not only the nasal,* but also the comparative sibilant through all the cases. For an example, *gerésnis*, "the better" (m.), may serve, with which we would compare the Sanskṛit *garîyâṅsam*, "*graviorem*" (nominative *garîyân*). It may be, but it is not of much consequence to us, that *gerêsnis* and *garîyâṅs* (strong theme) are also connected in the positive base; so that, as according to p. 398, in Greek and Gothic goodness is measured by depth, in Lithuanian it is measured by weight. The Sanskṛit comparative under discussion means, also, not only "heavier," or "very heavy," but also, according to Wilson, "highly venerable." In order, however, to analyze the Lithuanian *gerésnis*, we must observe that *gerésnis* stands for *gerésnias*, and the theme is clearly *GERÉSNIA;* hence genitive *gerésnio*, dative *gerésniam;* as *géro*, *gerám*, from *géra-s*.
[G. Ed. p. 427.] The termination *ia*, therefore—for which *ya* might be expected, the *y* of which, as it appears for the avoiding of a great accumulation of consonants, has been resolved into *i*—corresponds to the unorganic addition which we, p. 411, have observed in Sclavonic comparatives. We have now *geresn* remaining, which I regard as a metathesis from *gerens*,† through which we come very near the Sanskṛit *garîyâṅs*. But we come still nearer to it through the observation, that, in Lithuanian, *e* is often produced by the euphonic influence of a preceding *y* or *i* (§. 193). We believe, therefore, that here also we may explain *gerésn* as from *geryasn* (*geryans*), and further recall attention to the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬱𐬌𐬌𐬉𐬵𐬍 *maśyêhî* (§. 300.).

---

* In the Lith. comparative adverbs like *daugiaus*, "more," *mażaus*, "less," I regard the *u* as the vocalization of the *n*; thus *daugiaus* from *daugians*, where *ians*=Skr. *îyâṇs* of the strong cases.

† This has been already alluded to by Grimm (III. 635, Note *), who has, however, given the preference to another explanation, by which *esnis* is similarly arrived at with the Latin *issimus*.

The emphasis upon the *'e* of *géresnis* may be attibutable to the original length in the Sanskṛit strong theme *garîyâṅs.* Hence the astonishing accuracy may justly be celebrated with which the Lithuanian, even to the present day, continues to use the Sanskṛit comparative suffix *îyâṅs,* or rather its more rare form preferred in Zend *yâṅs.*

307. The Lithuanian superlative suffix is only another modification of the comparative. The nasal, that is to say, which in the latter is transposed, is, in the superlative, left in its original place: it is, however, as often happens, resolved into *u,** and to the *s* which ends the theme in the Sanskṛit, which, in Lithuanian, is not declinable (§. 128.), is added *ia:* hence *GERAUSIA*, the nominative of which, however, in departure from *gerésnis,* has dropped, not the *a,* but the *i*; thus *gerausa-s,* gen. *gerausio,* and, in the feminine, *gerausa, gerausiôs*; in which forms, [G. Ed. p. 428.] contrary to the principle which is very generally followed in the comparative and elsewhere, the *i* has exercised no euphonic influence.

"Remark.—With respect to the Sanskṛit gradation-suffixes *tara, tama,* I have further to add, that they also occur in combination with the inseparable preposition उत् *ut*; hence *ut-tara,* 'the higher,' *ut-tama,* 'the highest,' as above (§. 295.) *af-tuma,* and in Latin *ex-timus, in-timus.* I think, however, I recognise the base of *ut-tara, ut-tama,* in the Greek *ὑς* of *ὕσ-τερος, ὕσ-τατος,* with the unorganic spir. asp., as in *ἑκάτερος,* corresponding to the Sanskṛit *êkatara-s,* and with *σ* from *τ* (compare §. 99.), in which it is to be remarked that also in the Zend for *ut-tara, ut-tama,* according to §. 102., *us-tara, us-tĕma,* might be expected.

---

* Comp. §. 255. (*g.*); in addition to which it may be here further remarked, that in all probability the *u* also in Gothic conjunctives like *haitau, haihaityau,* is of nasal origin.

NUMERALS.

CARDINAL NUMBERS.

308. I. In the designation of the number *one* great difference prevails among the Indo-European languages, which springs from this, that this number is expressed by pronouns of the 3d person, whose original abundance affords satisfactory explanation regarding the multiplicity of expressions for *one*. The Sanskrit *êka*, whose comparative we have recognised in the Greek ἑκάτερος, is, in my opinion, the combination of the demonstrative base *ê*, of which hereafter, with the interrogative base *ka*, which also, in combination with *api*, "also" (nom. masc. *kô'pi*), signifies "whoever"; and even without this *api*, if an interrogative expression precedes, as Bhagavad-Gîtâ, II. 21, **कथं स पुरुषः पार्थ कङ् घातयति हन्ति कम्** *kathań sa purushaḥ Pârtha kan ghâtayati hanti kam*, "How can this person, O Pârtha, cause one to be slain, (or) slay one?" The Zend 𐬀𐬉𐬎𐬎𐬀 [G. Ed. p. 429.] *aêva*, is connected with the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs *êva*, "also," "only," &c., and *êvam*, "so," of which the latter is an accusative, and the former, perhaps, an instrumental, according to the principle of the Zend language (§. 158.). The Gothic *ain'-s*, theme *AINA*, our *einer*, is based on the Sanskrit defective pronoun *êna* (§. 72.) whence, among others, comes the accusative masculine *êna-m*, "this." To this pronominal base belongs, perhaps, also the Old Latin *oinos*, which occurs in the Scipionian epitaphs, from which the more modern *ûnus* may be deduced, through the usual transition of the old *ŏ* into *u*, which latter is lengthened to make up for the *i* suppressed. Still *ûnus* shews, also, a surprising resemblance to the Sanskrit *ûna-s*, which properly means "less," and is prefixed to the higher numerals in order to express diminution by one; as, *ûnaviṅshati*, "*undeviginti*," *ûnatriṅshat*, "*undetriginta*." This *ûnas* could

not have appeared in Latin, more accurately retained than under the form of *ûnu-s*, or, more anciently, *âno-s*. The Greek ʿEN is founded, it is highly probable, in like manner, on the demonstrative base एन *êna*, and has lost its final vowel, as the Gothic *AINA*, in the masculine nominative *ains:* with respect to the ἑ for *ê* compare ἑκάτερος. On the other hand, οἶος, "*unicus*," if it has arisen from οἶνος compare *oinos*), as μείζω from μείζονα, has retained the Indian diphthong more truly, and has also preserved the final vowel of एन *êna*. If ὄνος, the number one in dice, really has its name from the idea of unity, one might refer this word to the demonstrative base अन *ana*, Sclavonic *ONO* (nominative *on*, "that"), which also plays a part in the formation of words, where ονη corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix *anâ* (feminine of the masculine and neuter *ana*), if it is not to be referred to the medial participle in *âna*, as μονη to *mâna*. The Old Sclavonic, *yedin*, "one," is clearly connected with the Sanskrit आदि *âdi*, "the first," with *y* which has been prefixed according to §. 255. (*n.*): on the other hand, in the Lithuanian *wiena-s*, [G. Ed. p. 430.] if it is connected with the Gothic *AINA* and Sanskrit एन *êna*, an unorganic *w* has been prefixed. In regard to to the *ie* for ए *ê* compare, also, *wies-te*, "knowledge," with वेद्मि *vêdmi*, "I know."

"Remark.—The German has some remarkable expressions, in which the number *one* lies very much concealed as to its form, and partly, too, as to its idea: they are, in Gothic, *haihs*, "one-eyed," *hanfs*, "one-handed," *halts*, "lame," and *halbs*, "half." In all these words the number one is expressed by *ha*; and in this syllable I recognise a corruption of the abovementioned Sanskrit क *ka* for एक *êka*, "one," which is founded on the universal rule for the mutation of consonants (§. 87.). It would be erroneous to refer here to the Zend 𐬵𐬀 *ha* of 𐬵𐬀𐬐𐬆𐬭𐬆𐬙 *ha-kĕrĕṭ*, "once" (Sanskrit सकृत् *sakṛit*), as the Zend 𐬵 *h* stands, without exception, for the Sanskrit स् *s*, to which the *h* in Gothic never corresponds.* J. Grimm compares *haihs* with *cæcus* (II. 316), not with the purpose of following out the origin of these cognate words, but in order to prove the transition of the tenuis into the aspirate; for the simple aspiration stands in Gothic instead of *kh*, which is wanting. These words are, however, so far connected, that, in both, the word *eye* is contained. It is only the question whether the one-eyed in Latin has also lost the other eye, and if the blind (*cæcus*), in regard to etymology, has not preserved one eye left. This appears to me more probable than that the blind in Gothic should recover his sight, though but with one eye. The theme of *haihs* is *HAIHA*: one may, then, divide *HAIHA* into *HA-IHA* or into *H-AIHA*; thus the latter portion of this compound word is assuredly connected with the word अक्ष *akṣha*, "eye," in Sanskrit, which only occurs at the end of compounds; so that of the compounded क्ष *kṣh* only the first portion is left, while the Zend 𐬀𐬱𐬌 *ashi*, "eye"—which, in like manner, I have found only at the end of compound words, as 𐬑𐬱𐬬𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬱𐬍𐬨 *csvas-ashîm*, "the six-eyed"—has preserved the last element: the Latin *ocus*, however (the primitive base of *oculus*), preserves only the first like the Gothic. If in *HAIHA* the diphthong *ai* is left entirely to the share of the eye, we must assume that the *a* is introduced through the euphonic influence of the *h* (§. 82.), and that *AIHA* stands for [G. Ed. p. 431.] *IHA*, and this for *AHA*; as *fimf* from पञ्च *pancha*; *fidvôr* from चत्वार् *chatwâr*. But if the *a* of *HAIHA* is allotted to the numeral, which appears to me more correct, then the *h* in this word has not introduced any euphonic *a*, because, with the aid of the first member of the compound, the disposition of the *h* to *ai* was already satisfied. We must further recall attention to the Latin *cocles*, in which, however, the notion of unity is evidently represented only by the *c*, for the *o* must be left to the *ocles* as a derivative from *oculus*: *cæcus*, however, if *æ* is the correct way of writing, and if the number one is contained therein, would spring from *ca-icus*; and the Indian *a*, therefore, is weakened, as in Gothic, to *i*, which, in Latin compounds, is the usual representative of an *a* of the base (§. 6.). Let us now examine the one-handed. Its theme is, in Gothic, *HAUFA*, nominative abbreviated *haufs*; so that here, as in a skein, two bases and a pronominal remnant, as mark of case, lie together. The numeral is here the most palpable element: it is more difficult to search out the hand. In the isolated state no theme *nfa* could be expected; but in compounds, and also in prefixed syllables of reduplication, a radical vowel is often rejected; as, in the Sanskṛit जग्मिम *jagmima*, "we went," of the root गम् *gam*, only *gm* is left; and in the Greek, *πίπτω* for *πιπέτω*, ΠΕΤ, which corresponds to the Sanskṛit पत् *pat*, "to fall," is abbreviated to *πτ*. We shall, therefore, be compelled to assume that a vowel has fallen out between the *n* and *f* of *HA-NFA*. If it was an *i* which was displaced, then *NIFA* might pass as a transposition of the Sanskṛit पाणि *pâṇi*, "hand," with *f* for *p*, according to §. 87. In *HA-LTA*, "lame"—nominative *halts*—must *ha* again pass for a numeral, and *ha-lta* may originally signify "one-footed," for it is (Mark ix. 45.) opposed to the Gothic *tvans fôtuns habandin*, "having two feet," where it is said 'it is better for thee to enter into life with one foot, than having two feet to be cast into hell.' It is at least certain, that a language which had a word for one-footed would very fitly have applied it in this passage. If the last element, however, in *HA-LTA* means the foot, we must remember that, in Sanskṛit, several appellations of this member are derived from roots which mean "to go." Now, there is, in

---

* Connected, however, with this designation of "one," which is taken from the pronominal base *sa* (Greek ὁ), may be the Greek ἁ in ἁ-πλοῦς.

Gothic, a root *LITH*, "to go," with an aspirated *t*, indeed; but in compounds the consonants do not always remain on the same grade which they adopt in the simple word; [G. Ed. p. 432.] *e.g.* the *t* of *quatuor* appears as *d* in many derivatives and compounds, without this *d* thereby dissembling its original identity with the *t* of *quatuor* and चतुर् *chatur*. So, then, *HA-LTA* may stand for *HA-LITHA*; and it may be remarked, that from the root *LIT* comes, also, *lithus*, "the limb," as that which is moveable. Before I pass on to the explanation of *halb*, I must mention that J. Grimm divides the pronoun *selber*, as it appears to me very properly, into two parts; so that the syllable *si* of the Gothic *silba* devolves on the reciprocal (*sci-na, si-s, si-k*). With respect to the last portion, he betakes himself to a verb *leiban*, "to remain," and believes that *silba* may, perhaps, have the meaning of "that which remains in itself, enduring." Be this as it may, it is clear that *halbs*—the theme is *HALBA*—might be, with equal right, divided into two parts; and it appears to me, that, according to its origin, this word can have no better meaning than, perhaps, "containing a part"; so that the ideas *one* and *a part, remnant*, or something similar, may be therein expressed, and, according to the principle of the Sanskṛit possessive compounds, the notion of the possessor must be supplied, as in the already explained *haihs*, "having one eye." In the Gothic, also, *laiba* means "remnant." It scarcely needs remark, that *halb* is no original and simple idea, for which a peculiar simple word might be expected, framed to express it. The half is one part of the whole, and, in fact, equal to the absent part. The Latin *dimidius* is named after the middle through which the division went. The Zend has the expression 𐬥𐬀𐬉𐬨𐬀 *naĕma*, for *halb*, according to a euphonic law for *nêma*, which in Sanskṛit, among other meanings, signifies "part": this is probably the secondary meaning, and the half, as part of the whole, the original. If it is so, नेम *nêma* appears to me a very ingenious designation for a half, for it is a regular contraction of न *na*, "not," and इम *ima*, "this or that"; and the demonstrative therefore points at the "this or that" portion of the whole excluded by the negative *na*. In Sanskṛit, *halb* is termed, among other appellations, सामि *sâmi*, in which one recognises both the Latin *semi* and the Greek ἡμι; and the three languages agree in this also, that they use this word only without inflection at the beginning of compounds. As to its origin, सामि *sâmi* may be viewed as a regular derivative from सम *sama*, "equal," "similar," by a suffix *i*, by which the suppression of the final vowel, and widening of the initial vowel of the primitive, become necessary. If this explanation is well founded, [G. Ed. p. 433.] then in this designation of *halb* only one part of the whole, and, indeed, one equal to the deficient part, would be expressed, and the सामि *sâmi* would be placed as ἕτερον over against the deficient ἕτερον; and the Sanskṛit and German supply each other's deficiencies, so that the former expresses the equality, the latter the unity, of the part; *i.e.* each of the two languages only semi-expresses the half. As to the relation, however, of the Greek ἥμισυς to ἡμι, it follows from what has been already said—that the latter is not an abbreviation of the former, but the former is a derivation from the latter; and indeed I recognise in συ the Sanskṛit possessive *swa*, "*suus*," which, remarkably enough, in Zend enters into combinations with numerals with the meaning "part"; *e.g.* 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬴𐬬𐬀 *thri-shva*, "a third part," 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬴𐬬𐬀 *chathru-shva*, "a fourth part." In the accusative these words, according to §. 42., are written 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬴𐬏𐬨 *thri-shû-m*, 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬴𐬏𐬨 *chathru-shûm*, of which the last member comes very near to the Greek συν of ἥμισυν. Ἥμι-συς means therefore, "having one equal part," and the simple ἡμι means only the equal. The Sanskṛit designation of "the whole" deserves further to be mentioned, सकलस् *sa-kala-s*, which, as signifying that which joins the parts and unites them, is opposed to the German *halb* as applying to one part, and in a measure furnishes a commentary and guarantee for the correctness of my view of the latter. The word सकल *sakala* consists, though this is scarcely perceptible, of स *sa*, "with," and कला *kalâ*, "part," so that, if the latter is regarded in the dual relation—and the last member of a compound may express each of the three numbers—सकल *sakala* expresses that in which the two parts are together. Thus the word समग्र *sam-agra*, "full," is used especially in regard to the moon, as a body with points, *i. e.* that in which the two points touch one another. Transposed into Greek relations of sound *sakala-s* would give, perhaps, ὀκαλος, or ὀκελος, or ὀκολος; but from this the present ὅλος has rejected the middle syllallable, as is the case in κόρος, κοῦρος, compared with कुमारस् *kumâra-s*, "a boy."

309. II. The theme of the declension is, in Sanskṛit, *dwa*, which is naturally inflected with dual terminations: the Gothic gives for it *tva*, according to §. 87., and inflects it, in the want of a dual, as plural, but after the manner of pronouns: [G. Ed. p. 434.] nominative *tvai, tvôs, tva;* dative *tvaim;* accusative *tvans, thvôs, tva.** The Sanskṛit displays in the dual

---

* One would expect *tvô*, on account of the form being monosyllabic (§. 231.). In the genitive masculine and neuter I should look for *tvi-zê*, after the analogy of *thi-zê*, "*horum*," from *THA*, or *tvaizê*, according to the analogy of the definite adjectives (§. 287. p. 374 G. ed.), and according to the common declension *tv'-ê* (p. 276). However, the form *tvaddỵê* occurs three times in the sense of *duorum;* whence it is clear that the genitive of the base *TVA* was no longer in use in the time of Ulfila. The form *tvaddỵ'-ê* belongs to a theme *TVADDỴA* (as *harỵ'-ê* from *HARỴA*), and appears, from the ordinal number, which in Sanskṛit is *dwi-tîya* for *dwa-tîya*, to have introduced itself into the cardinal number. From *tvaddỵê*, by rejecting both the *d*—of which one is, besides, superfluous—and by changing the *y* into a vowel, we arrive at the Old High German *zueiô*, according to Isid. *zueiyô*, as *fior* from *fidvor;* also definite, *zueiêrô*, which, in Gothic, would be *tvaddyaizê*. Grimm appears, on the other hand, to have

no difference between the pronominal declension and the ordinary one, and *dwâu* is declined like *vṛikâu* (p. 274), *dwê* feminine like *dhârê* (p. 285), and *dwe* neuter like *dânê* (p. 276). As, however, the notions of number are much akin to those of the pronouns; and as अल्प *alpa*, "a little," forms, in the nominative plural masculine, अल्पे *alpê* (§. 228.); so from the masculine theme *dwa*, if it had a plural, might be expected *dwê*, to which, according to §. 78., the Gothic *tvai* would correspond, which it is not requisite to regard like adjectives terminating similarly, as if compounded with a definite pronoun, espe- [G. Ed. p. 435.] cially as a genitive *tvaizê*, which would make the latter view necessary, does not occur. To *tvai* corresponds, also, *bai*, "both," from the theme *BA*, neuter *ba*, dative *baim*, accusative masculine *bans*, which is to be deduced through aphæresis from the Sanskṛit base *ubha*, Old Sclavonic *oba* (nominative and accusative dual), from the base *OBO*. In Zend the masculine of the number two is 𐬛𐬬𐬀 *dva* (for *dvâ*, §. 208.), with which the Old Sclavonic *dva* is identical, while the feminine neuter *dvye* answers to the Sanskṛit *dwê* (§. 255. *e*.). The Zend neuter is *duyê*, with euphonic *y* (§. 43.), and the *v* resolved into *u*. In the Greek and Latin δύω, δύο, *duo*, the

---

have taken occasion, from the Old High German forms, to suppose a Gothic *tvaiyê* and *tvaiaizê*, in which I cannot agree with him. The Old Northern, by exchanging the dental medials with gutturals, gives *tvaggya* for the Gothic *tvaddyê*. In the accusative plural feminine is found, in Gothic, together with *tvôs* also *tveihnôs*, which presupposes a masculine and neuter base *TVEIHNA*. fem. *TVEIHÑO;* and in which the annexed *HNA* reminds us of the appended pronoun स्म *sma*, discussed at §. 165. &c., which, by metathesis, and with the alteration of the *s* into *h*, has in Prâkṛit and Pâli taken the form *mha* (comp. §. 169.). On this Gothic *TVEIHNA* is based the Old High German nominative and accusative masculine *zuênê* with loss of the *h*. The feminine, however, appears in Old High German free from this addition, and is in the nominative and accusative *zuô*, also abbreviated *zua* (comp. §. 69.).

old *v* is, in the same way, resolved into the *u*, but the final vowel of the base is not abandoned: δύω answers to the Vêdic masculine *dwâ* (§. 208.); but in distinguishing the genders the Greek is surpassed by the Latin and the other European sister languages. The Lithuanian has *du* in the nominative masculine, and *dwi* in the nominative feminine; with the closer explanation of which, and their dual declension, we will not here occupy ourselves further. It is, however, to be remarked of the Sanskrit numeral, that the *a* of *dwa* is, in the beginning of compounds, weakened to *i* (compare §. 6.): hence *dwi*, which is represented by the native grammarians as the proper theme (comp. p. 102). The Greek, in which δϜι is inadmissible, gives in its stead δι; hence, διμήτωρ = द्विमातृ *dwimâtri* (theme), "having two mothers." The Zend and Latin agree in the corruption of this *dwi* very remarkably, in this point, that they have both dropped the *d* and have both hardened the *v* to *b*; hence 𐬠𐬌𐬞𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬱𐬙𐬀𐬥𐬀 *bipaitistana*, "with two nipples," like *biceps*, *bidens*, and others. From this abbreviated *bi*, comes, in both languages, also the adverb *bis*, "twice," in contrast to the Sanskrit *dwis* and Greek δίς: the Greek δι, however, in compounds, cannot be regarded as an abbreviation of δίς, as is wont to be done. The German dialects, with exception of the Old High German, require, according to §. 87., *tvi* for *dvi*, as the initial member of compounds; this is furnished by the Anglo-Saxon in compound words like *tvi-fête*, "*bipes*," *tvi-finger*, "*duos digitos longus*," *tvi-hive*, "*bicolor*." The Old High German gives *zui* (=*zwi*) or *qui*; *e. g. zui-beine*, "*bipes*," *qui-falt*, "*duplex*" (Grimm III. 956.). The adverb *zuiro*, more fully *zuiror*, also *quiro*, "twice," belongs, according to its formation, but not without the intervention of another word, to the above *dwis*, δίς, *bis*; but it is clear, from the Old Northern *tvis-var*, that *ro* has arisen from *sva* by apocope of the *a* and vocalization of the *v*, perhaps more

[G. Ed. p. 436.]

anciently to *u*, and thence to *o* (§. 77.) as in *dëo* (also *diu*), "a servant," genitive *diwe-s*, from the base *DIWA*. Whence comes, however, the Old Northern *svar*, which occurs also in *thrisvar*, "thrice," and with which the English *ce* in *twice, thrice,* is connected. I believe that the *s*, which precedes the *var*, is certainly identical with the *s* of द्विस् *dwis*, *δίς*, and त्रिस् *tris*, *τρίς*, but the annexed *var* corresponds to the Sanskṛit substantive *vâra*, which signifies period and time; hence *êkavâra*, "once" (see Haughton), and *vâramvâram*, "repeatedly." Hence comes the Persian *bâr*, *e.g.* *bâr-i*, "once"; and as the original meaning of this word is "time," and we have already seen, in Persian, the transition of the *v* into *b*, we may hence very satisfactorily explain the Latin *ber* in the names of months; and *Septem-ber*, therefore, is literally the seven-time, *i.e.* the seventh time-segment of the year. But to return to the Old Northern *svar*, in *trisvar*, *thrisvar*, which we must now divide into *tris-var*, *thris-var*, according to the explanation which has been given, the idea of time, is expressed therein twice, which is not surprising, as in the Old High German *mêriro*, also mentioned above, the comparative suffix is twice contained, because it is no longer felt the first time, by the genius of the language, with sufficient clearness. As then, in Old High German, first the *r*, and more lately also the *o* (from *v*), of *s-var* has been dropped, we see, in the Middle High [G. Ed. p. 437.] German *drir*, from *dris*, the form again returned into the original limits of the Sanskṛit-Greek *tris*.

310. III. The theme is, in the Sanskṛit, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, and Old Sclavonic, *TRI*, whence in the Gothic, according to §. 87., *THRI*, and exactly the same in Zend, according to another law of sound (§. 47.). The declension of this base is, in most of the languages mentioned, perfectly regular: it is only to be remarked of the Gothic, in which, however, all the cases cannot be

adduced, that on account of the word being monosyllabic, the *i* is not suppressed before vowel terminations, but becomes *iỵ* (compare the Pâli, §. 226.): hence the genitive *thriỵ-ê*, and nominative neuter *thriỵ-a* (§. 233.). Besides these, the dative *thri-m* and the accusative *thri-ns* may be cited. The Sanskṛit forms the genitive from an extended theme *traya*, hence *trayâ-ṇ-âm;* while the Zend *thry-aim* or *thray-aim* comes from the original base. Both languages, however, agree in this, that त्रि *tri*, 𐬚𐬭𐬌 *thri*, is only a theme of the masculine and neuter; and although, according to its termination, it might quite as well be assigned to the feminine, nevertheless the feminine number has an appellation peculiar to it, which is rather different from *tri*, *thri*, of which the theme is *tisar* (तिसृ *tisṛi*, §. 1.), the *a* of which, in the Sanskṛit nominative, accusative, and vocative, is irregularly suppressed; hence तिस्रस् *tisras*[†] for *tisaras*, Zend 𐬙𐬌𐬯𐬀𐬭𐬋 *tisarô*.

[G. Ed. p. 438.] 311. IV. The Sanskṛit feminine theme चतसर् *chatasar* (*chatasṛi*) follows the analogy of the *tisar* just mentioned; and the similarity between the two forms is so great that it appears, which is perhaps the fact, that the number three is contained in the fourth numeral; so that *tisr-as* would be a weakened form of *tasr-as*, and the *cha* prefixed to the number four would be identical with the particle, which means "and," and which, in other places, is attached to the end of the word. If one wished to press still farther into the deep mystery of the appellations of numbers, one might moot the question whether

---

[*] With this extended theme one may compare the Old High German nominative masculine *driê* in Isidor, which belongs to a theme *DRIA*, with pronominal declension. The feminine *driô*, from the base *DRIÔ*, of the same sound, presupposes in like manner a masculine and neuter theme *DRIA*.

[†] In the accusative, *tisras* is more organic than तिसृस् *tisṛis*, as it must stand according to the common rule (comp. §. 242.).

the syllables *tasa* in the theme *cha-ta-sar*, might not be considered as identical with the demonstrative bases of the same sound. I do not think, at least, that any language whatever has produced special original words for the particular designation of such compound and peculiar ideas as three, four, five, &c.; and as the appellations of numbers resist all comparison with the verbal roots,* the pronominal roots remain the only means by which to explain them. Without attempting to resolve the difficulties in the individual numbers, we will express the conjecture, that the operation of speech with regard to the numbers might originally be expounded nearly in this manner—that one might perhaps say, "it, this, that, and it, and this," &c.: thus the pronouns might actually suffice better than they appear to do in the forms of numerals which lie before us. But an obscuration of the original clearness of this method, which would occur in the course of time, would be owing also [G. Ed. p. 439.] to this, that a simple or compound word might undertake immediately to designate this or that number, and no other one, though equally adapted to denote it.

312. The masculine and neuter of the number four have, in Sanskṛit, चत्वार् *chatwâr* as the strong theme, and चतुर् *chatur* as the weak†; hence, nom. masc. *chatwâr-as*, accus. *chatur-as*, nom. accus. voc. neut. *chatwâr-i*: the gen. masc. and neut. is irregularly *chatur-ṇ-âm* for *chatur-âm*, since, according to the analogy of bases terminating with a vowel, a nasal

---

* Only in three might one perhaps think of the Sanskrit root तॄ *tṝ*, "*trans-gredi*," and consider three, therefore, as the more (than two). This verbal notion of passing over, adding, is, however, also the only possible one which could be blended with the names of numbers.

† To §. 129. is further to be added, that from the strong theme springs also the form of the nom., acc., and voc. plural of the neuter; while this kind forms the whole singular and dual from the weak theme.

is introduced (§. 246.). In the Zend the strong theme is 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬎𐬎𐬁𐬭 *chathwâr*, according to §. 47.; hence, nom. masc. 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬎𐬎𐬁𐬭𐬋 *chathwârô;* and the weak theme is, by transposition, 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎 *chathru;* as, *chathru-mâhîm*, "four months" (accus. sing.), Vend. S. p. 248. For the Sanskrit genitive चतुर्णाम् *chaturṇâm*, we find 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬯𐬥𐬄𐬨 *chathrusnaṅm* (l. c. pp. 204 and 206, with *a* inserted, 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬯𐬀𐬥𐬄𐬨 *chathrusanaṅm*); but in the beginning of compound words it is more frequently found 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬭𐬆 *chathwarĕ;* so that the weakening consists merely in the shortening of the *â*, and, according to §. 44., an *ĕ* is added to the *r*; as *chatwarĕ-paitistanyâo*, "of her with four teats" (gen. fem., Vend. S. p. 83). As to the European sister languages, one must expect, according to §. 14., for *ch*, gutturals and labials, hence, in Gothic *fidvôr*, and aspirates for smooth letters, according to §. 87. This *fidvôr* is based on the strong theme चत्वार् *chatwâr*, but in the state of declension extends the theme by an unorganic *i*, hence dative *fidvôri-m*, the only adduceable case. In Old Northern the nom. masc. is *fiôri-r*.

[G. Ed. p. 440.] The original theme *fidvôr* appears in the compound *fidvôr-tiguns*, "forty" (accus.): on the other hand, *fidur* in *fidur-dôgs*, "four days," is referable to the Indian weak theme *chatur;* whence, however, it should not be said that the weak theme of the German, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic has been brought from an Asiatic original site; for it was as easy for the Gothic, by suppressing the last vowel but one, to contract its *fidvôr* to *fidur*—like *thiu-s*, "servant," from *thiva-s*, gen. *thivi-s*—as for the Sanskrit to abbreviate *chatwâr* to *chatur*. The Lithuanian theme follows the example of abbreviation in its interior, but extends the theme at the end; the masc. nom. is *keturi*, and the feminine *keturios*: *KETURIĀ* serves the latter as theme: the masculine *keturi* is analogous with *gerì*, "the good" (see p. 251, Note ‡), and therefore has *KETURIE*, euphonic for *KETURIA*, as its base. The genitive and accusative masculine *keturi-ù, keturi-s,* proceed from the base *KETURI.* The Old Sclavonic gives *CHETYRI* as the masculine and feminine theme, and inflects the masculine like *GOSTI,* and the feminine like *KOSTI* (p. 349); hence nom. *chetyry-e, chetyri,* just as in the third numeral *triy-e, "tri";* and the feminine form may, in both, represent also the masculine, and always supplies the neuter. But the collective *chetvero,* and the ordinal number *chetverty-ĭ,* stand in closer agreement with the Indian strong theme चत्वार् *chatwâr:* the Latin *quatuor,* also, which, in disadvantageous comparison with the cognate languages, has lost the capability of declension, and the Greek τέσσαρ-ες, τέτταρ-ες, rest on the strong चत्वारस् *chatwâras;* so that τέτταρες, just like the Pâli form चत्तारो *chattârô,* has gained its last *t* by assimilatson of the semi-vowel. The Prâkrit form, also, which I am not able to quote, will scarcely be other than *chattârô* (comp. §. 300 p. 414 G. ed.). With regard to the initial τ let reference be made to §. 14., by which this τ is accommo- [G. Ed. p. 441.] dated with the Æolic πίσυρες, which refers itself to the weak theme चतुर् *chatur.* With the Zend transposition of the weak theme to *chathru* (p. 439 G. ed.), at the beginning of compounds, agrees surprisingly the Latin *quadru,* in *quadrupes* and other words. The adverbial *s,* by which द्विस् *dwis,* "twice," and त्रिस् *tris,* Zend *thris,* "thrice," are formed, is, in the Sanskrit *chatur,* suppressed by the rule of sound mentioned in §. 94.; hence *chatur,* "four times," for *chaturs.* That the latter has originally existed one learns from the Zend transposed form 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬱 *chathrus.* The Latin has already, in the number three, without being forced by a compulsory law, dropped the *s,* and hence *ter* and *quater* appear only as internal modifications of the cardinal numbers.

313. V. Sanskrit पञ्चन् *panchan,* Zend 𐬞𐬀𐬧𐬗𐬀𐬥 *panchan,* Lithuanian *penki,** Greek πέντε, Æolic πέμπε, Gothic

---

* This is the nominative masculine; the feminine is *penkios,* and holds the

*fimf,** Latin *quinque,* Old Sclavonic *pyaty.*† The Sanskrit-Zend *panchan* is the theme, and the genders are not dis- [G. Ed. p. 442.] tinguished in this and the following numbers; hence the nominative, accusative, and vocative have always singular neuter forms (therefore *pancha,* according to §. 139.): the other cases shew plural terminations; as, genitive पञ्चानाम् *panchânâm,* Zend 𐬞𐬀𐬥𐬗𐬀𐬥𐬄𐬨 *panchanaṇm* (Vend. S. p. 52). By this irregularity in the declension the Sanskṛit and Zend prepare us in a measure for complete want of inflection in Greek and Latin. Moreover, it is remarkable that not one of the European languages will at all recognise the final nasal, while, nevertheless, that of *saptan, navan,* and *daśan* is found also in Gothic and Lithuanian; and in Lithuanian, also, that of अष्टन् *aṣhṭan,* "eight" (*asztûni*). The Greek has frequently preserved an old *α*

---

the same relation to it that *keturios* does to *keturi* (p. 428). The same obtains with the appellations of the numbers 6, 7, 8, 9, of which we give only the masculine.

* Occurs only uninflected: in the declined theme, the unorganic addition of an *i* must be expected, as in *FIDVORI*; and as is also actually the case in Old High German in this number, and the appellations for the six to ten inclusive. In Gothic, however, occur also *saihs,* "six," *sibun,* "seven," *ahtau,* "eight," and *taihun,* "ten," only uninflected, and therefore without the unorganic *i*; but from *niun,* "nine," comes the genitive *niun-ê,* which indeed might also have proceeded from a theme *NIUN* or *NIUNA,* but which I doubt not comes from *NIUNI.*

† The theme is *PYATI,* and is inflected like *KOSTI* (p. 348), and with singular terminations; so that one has to look upon this numeral as a feminine collective, beside which the object numbered stands in apposition in like cases. The same obtains with the appellations for the numbers 6 to 10 inclusive. As to the formal relation of *PYATI* to *panchan,* we must observe, that of the latter, in Sclavonic, only the syllable *pa* is represented by *pya* (§. 225. *n.*); but *TI* is a derivational suffix, as in *SHESHTI,* "six," *DEVYATI,* "nine," and *DESYATI,* "ten," and corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix *ti* in the multiplied numbers *viṅsati,* "twenty," *ṣhaṣhṭi,* "sixty," &c.

before a nasal originally there, while it has preferred weakening the same to ε before other consonants; hence ἔτυψα(μ, ν), ἔτυψαν, but ἔτυψε(τ); τέτυφα(μι) but τέτυφε(τι); and so ἕπτα, ἐννέα, δέκα: not πέντα, however, but πέντε. It might therefore well be assumed, that the nasal in Indo-Zend numerals is a later addition, but that *cha* is the particle signifying "and," which, in the number four, we have taken for the prefix (§. 311.). In Latin, also, *quinque* is, in regard to its termination, similar to words connected with the particle *que*, as in πέντε the enclitic τε, which is akin to *que* and *cha* (see §. 14.) appears to be contained. This being the case, I would prefer regarding *pan* in पञ्च *pancha* as euphonic for *pam*, and the *m* as a neuter case-sign; but the *pa* which remains over as a pronoun, and indeed as identical with the *ka* which occurs in the number one (§. 308), in regard to which one might advert to the [G. Ed. p. 443.] old Latin *pidpid* for *quidquid*, ποῖος for κοῖος, &c. Five would, therefore, literally mean "and one," and in fact that one which is to be added to four.*

314. VI. Sanskrit षष् *shash*, Zend 𐬑𐬱𐬬𐬀𐬱 *csvas*, Lithuanian *szeszi*, Old Sclavonic *shesty* (theme *SHESHTI*, p. 430. Note †), Gothic *saihs* (see §. 82.), Latin *sex*, Greek ἕξ. One may justly suppose that the guttural which begins the Zend word has also existed in Sanskrit, for instance, क्षष्

---

* Ag. Benary, who likewise recognises in *pancha* the particle "and," seeks to compare the preceding syllable with *pâṇi*, "hand" (Berl. Jahrb. 1833. II. p. 49). If, however, a connection exists between the appellations of the hand and five, the former word might be named from the number of the fingers; as one might also venture an attempt to explain *digitus* and δάκτυλος with the number "ten," and our "finger," Gothic *figgrs* (=*fingrs*), theme *FIGGRA*, with *fünf* (*fimf*); so that in this word no transition of the guttural organ into the labial has taken place. I do not think it probable that *finger* in named from *fangen*, "to seize"; also, as far as regards the Greek and Latin, the appellation of each single finger is more likely to be derived from the total number than from pointing (δείκνυμι).

kṣhaṣh, for *ṣh* is otherwise not an initial syllable in Sanskṛit, and also no original sound, but that sibilant which is only admissible with a preceding *k* (§. 21.). In Latin, Greek, and German the guttural appears to be transposed, for *sex* is the transposition of *xes*.

315. VII. Sanskṛit सप्तन् *saptan*, Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬞𐬙𐬀𐬥 *haptan*, nominative and accusative सप्त *sapta*, 𐬵𐬀𐬞𐬙𐬀 *hapta* (see §. 313.), Greek ἑπτά, Latin *septem*, Lithuanian *septyni*, Old Sclavonic *sedmy* (theme *SEDMI*). The *m* of *septem* and *sedmy* seems to me to have been introduced from the ordinal number, which is, in Sanskṛit, *saptama*, nom. masc. *saptama-s*, and in Sclavonic *sedmyi*. The same holds good of the termination of *osmy*, "eight," and the Latin *novem*, *decem*, Sanskṛit *navama-s*, [G. Ed. p 444.] "the ninth," *daśama-s*, "the tenth"; for it is not probable that the *n* of the Sanskṛit cardinal number has become *m* in the abovementioned languages, as *m* is very frequently corrupted to *n*, especially at the end of words, where, in Greek, this transition is necessary; while the reverse method of the *n* to *m* scarcely occurs anywhere.

316. VIII. Sanskṛit अष्टन् *aṣhṭan* or अष्टौ *aṣhṭâu*; from the former the nominative and accusative *aṣhṭa*, from the latter again *aṣhṭâu*; Zend 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀𐬥 *astan*, nominative 𐬀𐬯𐬙𐬀 *asta*, Lithuanian *asztûni*, Gothic *ahtau*, Greek ὄκτω, Latin *octo*, Old Sclavonic *osmy* (theme *OSMI*). The Sanskṛit *aṣhṭâu* and the analogous ὄκτω appear, as it were, in a dual dress (see §. 206.); nevertheless, *aṣhṭâu* is, in my opinion, just as much as *aṣhṭan*, a bare theme, and has perhaps proceeded from the latter form, which occurs only in Zend, by the resolution of the *n* to *u*, which is so common (comp. p. 415, Note), and the lengthening of the *a*; if it is not preferred to develope it from *aṣhṭas*, according to the analogy of §. 206. From अष्टौ *aṣhṭâu* comes, by suppression of the last element of the diphthong, *aṣhṭâ-bhis*, *aṣhṭâ-bhyas*, *aṣhṭâ-su*, as *râ-bhis*, &c., from *râi*, "thing," "riches," while *aṣhṭân*, in the cases mentioned, forms regularly *aṣhṭabhis*, *aṣhṭa-*

bhyas, ashṭâsu (comp. p. 304). The genitive has only one form, namely, अष्टानाम् *ashṭânâm*. The strength of the *âu* of *ashṭâu* is preserved, also, in the cognate languages, and indeed in the Latin *octav-us*, Greek ὄγδοος for ὄγδοϝ-ος, and in German forms as *ahtowe-n*, dative, according to Notker the cardinal number from *ahtowi-m*, from the theme *AHTOWI*. But if *ashṭâu* were connected in its base with चतुर् *chatur*, "four," there would be strong reason for considering the former form as the dual, expressing four twice, and for assuming that an unorganic corruption of a dual termination, which made its appearance in the earliest antiquity, has grown up with the theme.

317. IX. Sanskṛit नवन् *navan*, Zend [G. Ed. p. 445.] 𐬥𐬀𐬬𐬀𐬥 *navan* (nominative and accusative *nava*), Gothic *niun* —by contracting the *va* to *u* and weakening the *a* to *i*, as is so common, §. 66.—Latin *novem* (see §. 315.), Greek ἐννέα, Lithuanian *dewyni*, Old Sclavonic *devyaty* (theme *DEVYATI*). The last two appellations appear foreign to the system of the other sister languages: they are based, however, as I have already remarked in another place,* on the facile interchange of a nasal with the organically corresponding medial on which, among others, rests the relation between βροτός and मृतस् *mṛitas*, "*mortuus*." As regards the origin of this numeral term, there exists a close connection in respect of form with the expression for "new" (Sanskṛit *nava*). That, however, a relation of ideas actually exists between the two designations, as Ag. Benary first acutely conjectured (Berl. Jahrb. 1832. ii. p. 50), appears to me likewise probable; for without recognising a dual in *ashṭâu*, and without excluding the thumbs in reckoning by the fingers, the number nine can still only be thought of with reference to the earlier numbers, and as next to eight; and

---

* Historical and Philological Transactions of the Academy of Letters for the year 1833, p. 168.

nine, in contrast with eight or all the preceding numbers, is just as much a new number, as that which is new itself is always a something later and successive, a *this* corresponding to the old *that*. As a case in point, observe the Latin *secundus* from *sequor*. One must also admit that it would not be surprising if any former number whatever, excluding one, were named after the idea of that which is new, and that this origin is most intimately connected with the pronominal origin of other numerals.

[G. Ed. p. 446.] 318. X. Sanskrit दशन् *daśan,* Zend 𐬛𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬥 *daṡan* (nominative and accusative *daṡa*), Greek δέκα, Latin *decem,* Lithuanian *deszimt, deszimt'-s* and *deszimtis* (the two first indeclinable), Old Sclavonic *desyaty* (theme *DESYATI,* see §. 313. Note †), Gothic *taihun.* Concerning the *ai* and *u* of *taihun,* see §§. 66. and 82.: the consonants have obeyed the law of removal (§. 87.). The Greek, rather than the Sanskrit, therefore serves as prototype to the Gothic in regard to the second consonant; and we have laid down in §. 21. the Sanskrit श् *ś* as a proportionably modern sound. If, then, in this corruption, the Lithuanian and Sclavonic agree with the Sanskrit, this may be so explained, that these languages, guided independently by the Sanskrit and Zend, but with the same euphonic feeling, have transformed an old guttural to a sibilant;* in which change of sound, however, the Sclavonic, in other cases, goes farther than the Sanskrit (comp. p. 415 G. ed.). If, however, we desire to base on historical tradition the peculiar coincidence with the Sanskrit and Zend in the case before us, and some others, we must arrive at this through the assumption that the Lithuanian and Sclavonic races at some period wandered from their original settlement in Asia, when corruptions had already entered into the language, which did not exist at the time when the Greeks and Romans transplanted the Asiatic original language to Europe.

---

* But not universally, where, in Sanskrit, श् *ś* is found; for *aśman,* "a stone," nom. *aśmâ,* is, in Lithuanian, *AKMEN,* nom. *akmů* (§. 139.), and in Old Sclavonic *KAMEN,* nom. *kamy* (§. 264.).

319. XI—XX. The smaller numbers are combined with the expression for ten: Sanskrit एकादशन् *êkâdaśan*, द्वादशन् *dwâdaśan*, त्रयोदशन् *trayôdaśan*, चतुर्दशन् *chaturdaśan*, &c.; Zend 𐬀𐬉𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬛𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬥 *aêvandaśan* (?), 𐬛𐬬𐬀𐬛𐬀𐬱𐬀𐬥 *dvadaśan*;* Greek ἕνδεκα, δώδεκα, τρισκαίδεκα, τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα; [G. Ed. p. 447.] Latin *undecim*, *duodecim*, *tredecim*, *quatuordecim*; Lithuanian *wienolika*, *dwylika*, *trylika*, *keturólika*; Gothic *ainlif* (1 C. xv. 5.), *tvalif*,† *fimftaihun*, "fifteen"; Old Sclavonic *chetyrinadesyaty*, "fourteen," *pyatynadesyaty*, "fifteen," &c.

"Remark.—Before the simple *daśan* (from *dakan*) had been changed in the Gothic into *taihun*, according to the

---

[*] These may be deduced from the ordinals *aêvandaśa*, *dvadaśa* (Vend. S. p. 120). So also *chathrudaśan*, "fourteen," *panchadaśan*, "fifteen," from *chathrudaśa*, "the fourteenth," *panchadaśa*, "the fifteenth." The nasal in *aêvandaśa* appears to have proceeded from *m*, and to be an accusative sign, for the whole stands l. c. in the accusative (*aêvandaśĕm*). By this, doubt is thrown on the *aêvandaśan* given above, and perhaps *aêvôdaśan*, or, according to the original principle of the compound, *aêvadaśan* might be expected. In one other passage, indeed, occurs the nominative of the ordinal *aêvandaśô* (l. c. p. 230): it is, however, clearly a false reading, and the sense requires the accusative, as governed by 𐬟𐬭𐬁𐬯𐬥𐬀𐬊𐬌𐬙𐬌 *frâsnaôiti*, which Anquetil renders by *a atteint*; thus, 𐬀𐬉𐬬𐬀𐬥𐬛𐬀𐬱𐬆𐬨 𐬟𐬭𐬁𐬯𐬥𐬀𐬊𐬌𐬙𐬌 *aêvandaśĕm frâsnaôiti*, "*decimum attingit*"; and in the following analogous constructions the ordinal number also stands always in the accusative. The form *aêvandaśĕm*, from *aêvamdaśĕm*, is remarkable, also, in a phonetic respect, because elsewhere in Zend a final *m* is not governed by the organ of the following letter.

[†] I do not take the *tva* here, with Grimm (II. 947.), for the neuter, but, according to the principle of genuine compounds, for the theme (compare §. 112.), whence the nom. masc. *tvai*. *Tva* may also—and this appears to me more correct—be regarded, without the Gothic being conscious of the formation, precisely as the abbreviation of the Sanskrit *dwâ*, which is a lengthening of the theme *dwa*, as *êkâ* from *êka*.

comparatively recent law for the alteration of sounds (compare §. 82.), it may have happened that, through the very widely-diffused disposition for exchanging the *d* with *l*, and through the not less common permutation between gutturals and labials—through which, among others, the relation of *fidvôr* to the Lithuanian *keturi* and Latin *quatuor* becomes explicable—the *daśan* contained in *ekâ-daśan* "eleven," and *dwâ-daśan*, "twelve" (from *dakan*), may have passed, in Gothic, into *LIBI*. Through the dative *tva-libi-m*, genitive *tva-lib'-ê*, *LIBI* is preserved, in fact, as the true theme; so that each *a* of *daśan* is weakened to *i*. The *f* of [G. Ed. p. 448.] the uninflected *tvalif* is, therefore, not to be explained according to §. 87., but according to §. 93^a.; and if the theme *libi* has not obeyed the law for the mutation of sounds, the objection, which has been raised by Graff (Old High German Thesaurus, p. 317) against my explanation, is removed by what has been remarked in §. 89., for we refer to *fidvôr*, not *fithvôr*. The Latin *quadraginta*, also, for *quatraginta*, and the Greek ὄγδοος for ὄκτοος, ἕβδομος for ἕπτομος, and several others, may be noticed, in support of the proposition that the numeral formations in the choice of the degree of the organ of the consonants have not always remained in the customary path; and in cumbrous compounds the medials are more admissible than the smooth letters and aspirates.* To remove the objection which may be taken on the ground that *LIBI* is so very different from the form of *taihun*, we may remark, that, in French also, the number ten, in compounds like *on-ze, dou-ze, trei-ze,* is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable *ze* to be akin, or originally identical with *dix,* if it were not historically certain that *onze, douze,* &c., have arisen from *undecim, duodecim,* and that therefore *ze* is a corruption of *decim,* as *dix* is a less vitiated form of *decem.* If, then, *onze, douze,* &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our *eilf* and *zwölf,* in which, perhaps, as in *onze* and *douze,* a connection with *ein* and *zwei* may be recognised, but none with *zehn*; and in the English eleven, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our using for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not *dreilf, vierlf,* or similar forms in *lf,* but *dreizehn, vierzehn,* &c., in which *zehn* is just as unaltered as the *drei* and *vier,* this arises from the Germans having forgotten the old Indo-European compounds for these numbers, and then having compacted the necessary expressions anew from the elements as they exist uncompounded. Nay, even [G. Ed. p. 449.] the Greek has reconstructed afresh, as well as it could, its numerals from thirteen upwards, after that the old more genuine compounds had fallen into disuse; but this has been done, I must say, in a clumsy, awkward fashion, by which the addition of a particle signifying *and* was found requisite in an attempt at extreme perspicuity, while ἕνδεκα, δώδεκα, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of τρισκαίδεκα (for τρίδεκα) is "thrice and ten," and the numeral adverb τρίς, instead of the bare theme τρι, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskṛit *chatur-daśan,* not *chatvâras-daśan* (*chatvârô-daśan*). On the other hand, the Sanskṛit, in the designation of the number thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of *tri-daśan*, *trayô-daśan*—euphonic for *trayas-daśan*—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin *tre-decim* is therefore a more pure formation, as it dispenses with a case-sign in the first member of the compound: just so the Lithuanian *try-lika*, not *trys-lika*. This *lika*, which concludes the form, in all Lithuanian adding numerals (eleven to nineteen), exchanges the old *d* for *l*, as in German, and is therefore as far estranged from the simple *deszimt's* as the Gothic *libi* from *taihun*; partly, as the second consonant in *lika* has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that *lika* and δέκα resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian *lika*, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic *libi* and the French *ze* in *onze*, *douze*, &c., from the old compound which has been handed down, and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers *wieno-lika*, *dwy-lika*, &c., do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—as, perhaps, *septyni* is felt to be independent of each of the earlier numbers—so, naturally, in these compounds the first member has kept tolerably equal pace with the form which it shews in its isolated state; on which account *wieno-lika*, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from एकादशन् *êkâ-daśan*, [G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic *ainlif*, in Greek ἕνδεκα, in Latin *undecim*, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, δώδεκα is almost entirely the Sanskrit *dwâ-daśa*

---

* The Anglo-Saxon *endleofan*, *endlufan*, compared with *tvelf*, and the Old Friesian *andlova* with *twilif*, should not make us doubt, since the Anglo-Saxon *eo* corresponds to the Sanskṛit *a* of *daśan* and Gothic *i* of *lif*, as in the relation of *seofon* (Old Friesian *siugon*) to the Sanskṛit *saptan*, Gothic *sibun*. Let, then, the Old Friesian *o* of *lova* be regarded like that of *siugon*. To the Sanskṛit *chatwâr*, Gothic *fidvôr*, correspond the Anglo-Saxon *feover*, Old Friesian *fiuwer*.

(ω for *â*, according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as υ (*Ϝ*) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the preceding consonant (compare τέτταρες from τέτϜαρες), for δδώδεκα could not be uttered. In Latin, *duodecim* has formed its first member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the French has paid no regard to the form in which the preceding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbreviations which time has by degrees introduced. With reference to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said *unze*, *deuze*, *troize*, &c. After what has been stated, I think no one can any longer doubt, that in our *eilf* (*elf*) and *zwölf*, strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with *daśan*, δέκα, and *zehn*. If, however, the older *LIBI*, *lif*, and Lithuanian *lika*, be regarded without the suspicion arising, that in them corrupt though very common permutations of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose in Lithuanian a root *lik*, and in Gothic *lif* or *lib* (Gothic *af-lifnan*, "*relinqui, superesse*," *laibôs*, "*reliquiæ*"), which both signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other and with the Greek λείπω (ΛΙΠ). Grimm, who has recognised (II. 946) the original identity of our *lif* and the Lithuanian *lika*, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by Ruhig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the latter from *likti*, "*linqui, remanere*," the former from *leiban*, "*manere*." Ruhig, according to Mielcke, p. 58, holds *lika* for the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the cardinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding the 3d person plural number present indicative *lika* (from *likù* s. *liekmi*); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the simple number, *e.g.* one, two, &c.; which addition, however, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding

[G. Ed. p. 451.] simple number must be regulated."* The languages, however, do not proceed so pedantically; and if they hold any thing understood, as very commonly happens, they do not expressly state that any thing remains over to be expressed. It is certain, however, that the Sclavonic languages, in their expressions for eleven to twenty, do not keep back any thing to be understood, but form those expressions, after the loss of the old, no longer intelligible compounds, anew, with the annexed preposition *na*, "over"; *e. g.* in Old Sclavonic, where the numbers eleven, twelve, thirteen, no longer occur, *chetyri-na-desyaty*, "four over ten." The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are *yedinyĭ-na-desyaty*, "the first over ten," *vtoryĭ-na-desyaty*, "the second over ten." In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian —accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which *weenpazmit* signifies "eleven," as it appears to me, with contraction of the *d*(*e*)*s* of *desmit*, "ten," to *z*, and overleaping the *e*. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older *lika* being no longer intelligible. If it was to be so understood, as Ruhig has taken it, its form would be palpable, and the Lettians might have been satisfied with it. With reference to the composition of the numerals under discussion, there remains to be noticed a most remarkable coincidence of the Lithuanian and German with a Prâkṛit dialect, which coincidence, when I formerly touched upon this subject,* was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of Urvasi (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दह *daha*—approaching closely to the Gothic *taihun*—but at the end of the compounds under notice *raha*: *r* and *l*, however, are, according to §. 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, वारह *vâraha*, "twelve," from द्वादश *dwâdaśa*, and अट्ठारह *aṭṭhâraha*, "eighteen," from अष्टादश *aṣhṭâdaśa*, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this cate- [G. Ed. p. 452.] gory, have an *r* for *d*, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the *d* for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this *raha* we should be led to the root *rah*, "to leave," which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindûstânî grammar, where I was agreeably surprised by perceiving that here, also, the number ten, in the designation of eleven, twelve, &c., has taken another lighter form than in its simple state, in which it is pronounced *das*.‡ But in the compounds under discussion this becomes *rah*,‡ and, for example, *bârah*,

---

* Grimm's view is certainly much more natural, "ten and one over, two over." Only it would be to be expected, if the language wished to designate the numbers eleven and twelve as that which they contain more than ten, that they would have selected for combination with one and two a word which signifies "and over, or more," and not an exponent of the idea "to leave," "to remain." It would, moreover, be more adapted to the genius and custom of the later periods of the language, not to forget the number ten in the newly-formed compounds, like the Lettish and Sclavonic. J. Grimm, in his "History of the German Language," p. 246, agrees with my explanation of *eilf*, *zwölf*, and analogous forms in Lith. and Sclavonic.

---

* Influence of the Pronoun on the formation of Words, p. 27; and Histor. Philol. Trans. of the Academy for the year 1833, p. 178, &c.

† The *a* of *rah* has been weakened in the cognate languages to *i*: hence *linquo*, Lithuanian *likù*, Greek λείπω (ἔλιπον), Gothic *af-lif-na*. In respect to the consonants, we refer the reader to §§. 20. 23.: remark, also, the connection of the Lithuanian *lakù*, "I lick," with the Sanskrit root *lih*, "to lick." Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Benfey, in assigning the Latin *linquo*, Greek λείπω, Gothic *af-lif-na*, to the Skṛ. root *rich*, from *rik*, "to leave."

‡ The text has *des* and *reh*, but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindûstânî numerals which follow.—*Translator*.

"twelve," answers to the abovementioned Prâkṛit बारह *bâraha*, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskṛit original form द्वादश *dwâdaśa*, without heeding the form of the simple *do*, "two," and *das*, "ten." It may be proper here to quote all the Hindûstânî compounds which belong to this subject, together with the corresponding Sanskṛit words of which they are the corruptions. We annex, also, the number twenty, and nineteen which is related to it as being twenty less one, as also the simple lower numbers in Hindûstânî.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

HINDÛSTÂNÎ.				SANSKṚIT, NOMINATIVE.	
êk	1,	*igâ-rah,*	11,	*êkâdaśa*	11.
do	2,	*bâ-rah*	12,	*dwâdaśa*	12.
tîn	3,	*têrah*	13,	*trayôdaśa*	13.
châr	4,	*chau-dah*	14,*	*chaturdaśa*	14.
pânch	5,	*pand-rah*	15,	*panchâdaśa*	15.
chhah	6,	*sô-lah*	16,†	*ṣhôḍaśa*	16.
sât	7,	*sat-rah*	17,	*saptadaśa*	17.
âṭh	8,	*aṭhâ-rah*	18,	*aṣhṭâdaśa*	18.
nau	9,	*unnîs*	19,	*ûnavinśati* ("*undeviginti*")	19.
das	10,	*bîs*	20,	*vinśati*	20.

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskṛit by शति *śati*, शत् *śat* or ति *ti*; in Zend by 𐬯𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *ṡaiti*, 𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬀 *ṡata*, or 𐬙𐬌 *ti*; and the words therewith compounded are substantives with singular terminations, with which, in Sanskṛit, the thing numbered agrees in case, as in apposition, or is put, as in the Zend, in the genitive, as

---

* The retention of the *d* is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with *r*, although in the Hindûstânî corruption this is no longer present. The Bengâlî has assimilated the *r* to the following *d*, hence *châuddo;* but, as a general rule, the Bengâlî in these compounds changes the *d* into *r*, and in all cases suppresses the Hindûstânî *h;* as *êgâro*, "eleven," *bâro*, "twelve," *têro*, "thirteen."

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its *l* for the *r* found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German *lika*, *lif*. The Bengâlî is *shôlo*.

dependent upon it. Occasionally, too, one finds these numerals in Sanskṛit used adjectively, with plural endings. Compare, [G. Ed. p. 454.]

	SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.
20,	विंशति *viṅśati,*	𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *vîṡaiti,*	εἴκατι,	*viginti,*
30,	त्रिंशत् *triṅśat,*	𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬀 *thriṡata,*	τριάκοντα,	*triginta.*
40,	*chatwâriṅśat,*	*chathwarĕṡata,*	τεσσαράκοντα,	*quadraginta.*
50,	*panchâśat,*	*panchâṡata,*	πεντήκοντα,	*quinquaginta.*
60,	*ṣhaṣhṭi,*	*csvasti,*	ἑξήκοντα,	*sexaginta.*
70,	*saptati,*	*haptâiti,*	ἑβδομήκοντα,†	*septuaginta.*
80,	*aśîti,*	....	ὀγδοήκοντα,	*octoginta.*
90,	*navati,*	*navaiti,*	ἐνενήκοντα,	*nonaginta.*
100,	*śata-m,*	*ṡatĕ-m,*	ἑ-κατό-ν,	*centu-m.*

"Remark.—I hold *śati, śat, ṡata, ti,* to be abbreviations of *daśati, daśat, daṡata,* and therefore derivations from *daśan,* "ten," by a suffix *ti, ta,* or *t*: the former is, in Lithuanian and Sclavonic, already contained in the simple *deszimt's*, *deszimtis*, Old Sclavonic *desyaty*. With regard, however, to the ten being expressed without abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in compounds, also—as in Lithuanian *dwideszimti* (or *tis*), "twenty," *trysdészimti* (or *tis*), "thirty," and in Old Sclavonic *chetyridesyaty*, "forty."* *pyatydesyaty*, "fifty"—I do not consider [G. Ed. p. 455.] this as a more true retention of the original form, but as a new formation. The Lithuanian, too, from forty upwards, separates the two numbers, and puts the former in the feminine plural, *e.g.* *keturios deszimtis*, "forty," *penkios deszimtis*, "fifty"; in which it is surprising that *deszimtis*, also, does not stand in the plural. The Gothic method in this numeral category is of comparatively recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the ancient compound, and gives, in the numbers under seventy (sixty does not occur), *tigus*, masculine, as the expression for ten, and declines this, and in twenty, thirty, the lesser number also, with regular plural terminations: hence the accusatives *tvanstiguns*, *thrinstiguns*, *fidvôrtiguns*, *fimftiguns*, genitive *thriyêtigvê*. The substantive *tigus*, however, is the etymological quaver to *taihun*, and *LIBI*: it is related to the former essentially, the aspirate having become a medial (see §. 89.), thus rendering the *a*, which, in *taihun*, is brought in by the rule of sound mentioned in §. 82., superfluous. Advert, also, to the Latin medials in *ginti*, *ginta*, contrasted with the Greek κατι, κοντα, which answer better to δέκα. *Tigu-s* may be identical with the Sanskrit ordinal *daśa*, nominative masculine *daśa-s*, which occurs only in compounds, as *dwâdaśa-s*, "the twelfth." To this *daśu-s*, therefore, is related *tigu-s* in regard to its *u*, as *fôtu-s* to *pâda-s*, "a foot." In the numbers seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by the neuter substantive *têhund* (theme *TEHUNDA*, genitive *têhundi-s*); hence *sibun-têhund*, "seventy," *ahtau-têhund*, "eighty," *niun-têhund*, "ninety." The *ê* of this *TEHUNDA* stands as the representative of the *ai* of *taihun*, and I hold *DA* to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic *N*, or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence *TAIHUNDAN*, nominative *taihunda*, "*decimus*." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned *tigus* also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to *zig* or *ssig* (*dreissig*), and is found also in *siebenzig*, *achtzig*, *neunzig*, Old High German *sibunzog*, *ahtozog*, *niunzog*, or *-zoc*, and *zëhanzog* (*zoc*), Gothic *taihuntêhund*, "a hundred." The Sanskṛit-Zend *śata*, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative शतम् *śatam*, 𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬆𐬨 *śatĕm*—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (*daśan*), whence it is formed by the suffix *ta*—the suppression of the final nasal is regular;—so that it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of *daśata*, as above, शति *śati*, शत् *śat*, and the Zend 𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬀 *śata* for *daśati*, &c. This abbreviation, however, which has given to the word the stamp of a primi- [G. Ed. p. 456.] tive expression specially created for the idea "a hundred," is proved to be of the highest antiquity by the consentaneous testimony of all the cognate languages, Greek κατόν (ἑκατόν is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin *centum*, Lithuanian *szimta-s* (masculine), Old Sclavonic *sto* (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).* The Gothic *hund* and Old High German *hunt* (theme *HUNDA*, *HUNTA*) occur only in compounds, as *tva-hûnda*, *thria-hunda*, *zuei-hunt*, *driu-hunt*, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also शति *śati*, शत् *śat*, and the corresponding words in the cognate languages, have in the earliest periods lost the initial syllable of the number ten, and with it the lingual remembrance of the same; and that in विंशति *viṅśati*, 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬀𐬌𐬙𐬌 *vîśaiti*, *εἴκατι*, *εἴκοσι*, *viginti*, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the *d* of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce *bis* from *dwis*, and *bi* from *dwi*, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of विंशति *viṅśati*, the Prâkṛit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the *d* in the number twelve also (*vâraha* for *dwâraha*). It is remarkable that the four oldest and most perfect languages of the Indo-European family in the category of numerals before us, have lost exactly as much of the number ten as the French in the forms for eleven, twelve, &c.; and the *ze* of *douze* is therefore identical with the Sanskṛit *śa* of विंशति *viṅśati*. The Sanskṛit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word *daśati* to be melted down to the derivation suffix *ti*, and this *ti* corresponds to the French *te* of *trente*, *quarante*, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskṛit and Zend, with sixty, षष्टि *shashṭi* (*ṭi* euphonic for *ti*), 𐬑𐬱𐬬𐬀𐬱𐬙𐬌 *csvasti*. To the *śati* of विंशति *viṅśati* 𐬬𐬍𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬌 *vîśati*, regularly corresponds the Doric *κατι* of *εἴκατι*, while in the Latin *ginti* the smooth

---

* The numerals in *ṡata,* answering to the Sanskṛit forms in *śat,* are neuters, and occur, like the forms in *ti,* very frequently in the 6th and 12th Fargard of the Vendidâd, but only in the accusative singular, in which *ṡatĕm* might also belong to a theme *ṡat.* That, however, *ṡata* is the theme and the neuter form is clear from Vend. S. p. 230. (in the 7th Fargard), where *pancha ṡatĕm* (*panchâṡatĕm*), "fifty," stands as nominative. From *csvasti,* "sixty," *haptâiti,* "seventy," and *navaiti,* "ninety," we find the accusative *csvastîm, haptâitîm, navaitîm:* on the other hand, in the 12th Fargard, occurs several times *vîṡaiti* (also written *vîṡati* and *viṡati*) as accusative of *vîṡaiti,* which perhaps is a dual neuter form (two decades), and according to this would stand for *vîṡaitî* (§. 210.). But if the final vowel is retained in its original form it is a singular neuter. It is, however, remarkable, that only this final *i,* and no other, is again found in the cognate Latin and Greek forms.

† This and the following number are renovated forms, in which the first member proceeds unorganically from the ordinal number. We might have expected ἑπτήκοντα, ὀκτώκοντα, for the latter Ion. ὀγδώκοντα. In ἐνενήκοντα the two ν are separated from each other: the epic form ἐννήκοντα is more genuine.

---

* Twenty and thirty do not occur.

---

* In Zend *śta* occurs frequently for *śata*, and just so in the numbers compounded therewith.

[G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in *ginta*=*κοντα* of the higher numbers. In Sanskṛit the *ṅ* of *viṅśati*, *triṅśat, chatwâriṅśat*, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin *ginti, ginta, centum*, and in the Gothic *HUNDA*, "one hundred," it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, *chatwâriṅśat* shews its relation to the neuter *chatwâri* (see §. 312.); as also τρια, τεσσαρα in τριᾱκοντα, τεσσαράκοντα, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in τριᾱ, and originally, also, in τεσσαρα, as the Ionic τεσσαρήκοντα, Doric τετρώκοντα,* Latin *quadraginta*, prove. These forms excite the conjecture, that, in Sanskṛit, the introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long *i* of the Zend *vîśaiti*, as in the long *a* of पञ्चाशत् *panchâśat*, 𐬞𐬀𐬥𐬗𐬁𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬆𐬨 *panchâśatĕm* from *panchan* (§. 318.), and to which again the length of πεντήκοντα, *quinquaginta*, runs parallel. The Zend *chathwarĕ*, in 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬡𐬀𐬭𐬆𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬀 *chathwarĕśata*, "forty" (Vend. S. p. 380), is likewise stronger than *cha-thru-śata*, which might have been expected from §. 312. As 𐬯𐬀𐬙𐬀 *śata* is a neuter, to which, in Greek, κατον or κοντον would correspond, κοντα therefore, and the Latin *ginta*, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of τριᾱ and τεσσαρα is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in ἑξήκοντα, would at least be very superfluous in the theme ΤΡΙ; and it is much more probable that ἑξη, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare ἑξά-κις, ἑξαπλοῦς, and the remarks on πάντα and πολλά, p. 401, G. ed.

---

* The ω for ᾱ is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the ρ, τετρω answers to τετρα in τετράκις, τετραπλοῦς, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.

ORDINAL NUMBERS.

321. While, in designating the number one, the greatest variety obtains amongst the Indo-European languages, they are [G. Ed. p. 458.] almost unanimous in their designation of *the first*, which idea none of the languages here treated of derives from the corresponding cardinal number: Sanskrit प्रथमस् *prathama-s* (nom.), Zend 𐬟𐬭𐬀𐬚𐬆𐬨𐬋 *frathĕmô* (§. 56^b.), Latin *primu-s*, Lithuanian *prima-s*, Gothic *frum'-s* (for *fruma-s*, §. 135.), or indefinite *fruma* (theme *FRUMAN*, §. 140.), or, with newly-added superlative suffix, *frumist'-s*, Old High German *êristêr*, usually indefinite *êristo* (from the adverb *êr*, "before"), Greek πρῶτος, Old Sclavonic *pervyĭ*. प्रथम *prathama*, from the preposition *pra*, has been already discussed (p. 393 G. ed.); so the Greek πρῶτος is derived from the corresponding preposition πρό, the lengthening of which to πρω accords with the Sanskrit *prâ* in *prâtar*, "in the morning" (see p. 392 G. ed.). The suffix TO is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *tama* or *thama*, which occurs even in Sanskrit in चतुर्थस् *chatur-tha-s*, "the fourth," and षष्ठस् *shash-tha-s*, "the sixth," as also in Latin in the form of *TU* in *quartus*, *quintus*, *sextus*, while in Greek this abbreviation extends to all the ordinal numbers, exclusive of δεύτερος, ἕβδομος, and ὄγδοος. In Lithuanian the corresponding *TA* of four runs through all, but in such wise, that together with *septintas*, *asztuntas*, occur also *sékmas*, *ászmas*, which correspond to the Sanskrit सप्तमस् *saptama-s*, अष्टमस् *ashtama-s*, in which the last portion of the superlative suffix *tama* or *thama* has remained; of which kind of division, also, पञ्चमस् *panchama-s*, नवमस् *navama-s*, and दशमस् *daśama-s*, partake, which therefore complete, by their suffix, the *tha* of *chaturtha*, so that both united present the perfect word. The Zend agrees herein with the Sanskrit, only that its 𐬵𐬀𐬞𐬙𐬀𐬚𐬋 *haptathô* agrees more with *septintas* than with सप्तमस् *saptama-s* and *septimu-s*; and

that also 𐬞𐬎𐬑𐬜𐬋 *pug-dhô*, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian *penk-ta-s*. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 459.] in Greek, ὄγδοος for ὄκτοος; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, *basta* from *bandh*), and irregularly changed the *a* to *u*, as in 'ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit नख *nakha*, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in Sanskṛit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दशम *daśama*, 𐬛𐬀𐬯𐬆𐬨𐬀 *daśĕma*, and of all the derivational suffix only the *a* is left, before which the *a* of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादश *dwâdaśa*, 𐬛𐬬𐬀𐬛𐬀𐬯𐬀 *dvadaśa*, "the twelfth"; चतुर्दश *chaturdaśa*, 𐬗𐬀𐬚𐬭𐬎𐬛𐬀𐬯𐬀 *chathrudaśa*, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its *undecimus, duodecimus*, not *undecus, duodecus*; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in *lif*: hence, *tertius decimus* for the lost *tredecimus*, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskṛit-Zend *daśa* is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms *octav-us*, ὄγδο(ϝ)-ος, where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected ὄγδομος, *octomus*. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix *simu-s* (from *timu-s*=तमस् *tama-s*); thus *vicesimus* or *vige-*

[G. Ed. p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus*, as in Sanskṛit *vinśatitama-s, trinśattama-s.** In Latin, however, the termination *nti* or *nta* of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of *ē*. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskṛit इष्ठ *ishṭha*, in the ordinal numbers like εἰκοστός, τριακοστός, with the loss of the ι of ιστος, as in ἕκαστος, πόστος. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the τι, σι, and ντα of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old Higḥ German *drî-zugôsto*, "the thirtieth," *fior-zugôsto*, "the fortieth": but in the numbers from four to nineteen the *TAN* or *DAN*, in Gothic, corresponds, according to the measure of the preceding letter (§. 91.), to the suffix of the cognate languages, as in चतुर्थस् *chaturtha-s*, τέταρτο-ς, *quartu-s*, *ketwir-ta-s*. The *N*, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—*vierter*, "fourth," *fünfter*, "fifth," &c.; hence, Gothic *FIMFTAN*, nom. masc. *fimfta*.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base द्वि *dwi* "two" (p. 424), and from the त्रि *tri*, "three," contracted to तृ *tṛi*, the Sanskṛit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix *tîya*; hence *dwitîya-s*, *tṛitîya-s*. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin *ter-*

---

* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of *êkâdaśa-s*, "the eleventh"; hence, also, *vinśa*, *trinś-a*, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like *fimftataihunda*, "the fifteenth," the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the *n*, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or *fimfta* is here the regular abbreviation of the theme *FIMFTAN*, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Berl. Ann. May 1827. p. 759), bases in *n*, in strict accordance with the Sanskṛit, drop the *n* in the beginning of compounds.

tius, as also in the Old Sclavonic *tretiĭ*, fem. *tretiya*, which, like all the ordinal numbers, has only a definite declension, in which, however, the particular case occurs, that the defining element is brought with it direct from the East, while the *tyĭ* of *chetwertyĭ* and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with तीय *tîya* might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the थ *tha*, TO, *TU* of चतुर्थ *chaturtha*, τέταρτος, *quartus*, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in *TO* (comp. the collective *chetvero*, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (*d.*), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that *chetvertyĭ*, *shestyĭ*, have to *chaturtha-s*, *ṣhaṣhṭha-s*, *sedmyĭ*, *osmyĭ*, have to सप्तम *saptama*, अष्टम *ashṭama*; and *pervyĭ*, "the first," to पूर्व *pûrva*, "the former;" which expressions, in Sclavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base *ẎO* (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the *î* of the suffix *tîya*, and abbreviated *dwi* to *bi*; hence 𐬠𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬀 *bitya*, 𐬚𐬭𐬌𐬙𐬌𐬌𐬀 *thritya*, in which it is to be remarked that the *y*, which is thus by syncope united with the *t* at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend *tya* corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle *î*, the Gothic *DẎAN* (from *dya*, §. 285.) in *THRIDẎAN*, nom. masc. *thridya*, the *y* of which in the Old High German *dritto*, has assimilated itself to the preceding *t*, in analogy with the Prâkṛit forms and Greek comparatives, like θάσσων, κρείσσων, κρείττων, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with διττός, τριττός (δισσός, τρισσός), which are evidently, in [G. Ed. p. 462.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskṛit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German *dritto* has to the Gothic *thriyda*. Regarding *tvaddyê*, "*duorum*," see p. 422, Note *: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun *anthar* (see p. 377), Old High German *andar*, Middle High German *ander*. Our *zweiter*, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Sclavonic *vtoryĭ* (see §. 297.)

answers, in respect to its derivation, to the Greek *δεύτερος*, and, in abbreviation of the base, to the Zend *bitya*, only that it has lost also the *i* of the Sanskṛit *dwi-tîya*, in regard to which we have, in §. 297., adverted to the Zend 𐬠𐬌𐬌𐬁𐬭𐬆 *b-yârĕ*[*], "two years."

323. We give here a general view of the ordinal numbers in the feminine nominative singular, since in this case the agreement of all the languages strikes the eye more than in the nominative masculine. The Gothic forms which do not occur we give in parentheses, formed theoretically, and according to the Old High German.

[G. Ed. p. 463.] NOMINATIVE FEMININE.

SANSKṚIT.	ZEND.	GR. DOR.	LATIN.	GOTHIC.	LITHUANIAN.	OLD SCLAVONIC.
prathamâ,	*frathĕma,*[1]	*πρώτᾱ.*	*prima,*	*fruma,*	*pirmà,*	*perva-ya.*
dwitîyâ,	*bitya,*	*δευτέρᾱ,*	*altera,*	*anthara,*	*antrà,*	*vtora-ya.*
tṛitîyâ,	*thritya,*	*τρίτᾱ,*	*tertia,*	*thridyô',*	*trĕchià,*	*treti-ya.*
chaturthâ,[2]	*tûirya,*	*τετάρτᾱ,*	*quarta,*	*(fidvôrdô'),*	*ketwirtà,*	*chetverta-ya.*
panchamâ,	*pugdha,*	*πέμπτᾱ,*	*quinta,*	*fimftô',*	*penktà,*	*pyata-ya.*[3]
ṣhaṣhṭhâ,	*cstvâ,*[4]	*ἕκτᾱ,*	*sexta,*	*saihstô',*	*szészta,*	*shesta-ya.*
saptamâ,	*haptatha,*	*ἑβδόμᾱ,*	*septima,*	*(sibundô'),*	*sékma,*	*sedma-ya.*
aṣhṭamâ,	*astĕma,*	*ὀγδόᾱ,*	*octava,*	*ahtudô',*	*ászma,*	*osma-ya.*
navamâ,	*nâuma,*	*ἐννάτᾱ,*	*nona,*	*niundô',*	*dewintà,*[5]	*devyata-ya.*[5]
daśamâ,	*daśĕma,*	*δεκάτᾱ,*	*decima,*	*taihundô',*	*deszimtà,*	*desyata-ya.*
êkâdaśâ,	*aćvandaśa,*[6]	*ἐνδεκάτᾱ,*	*undecima,*	*(ainliftô'),*	*wienólikta,*	*yedina-ya-na-desyaty.*
vinśati-tamâ,	*vîsaititĕma ?*	*εἰκοστᾱ,*	*vîcesima,*	....	*dwideszimtà,*	*vtoraya-na-desyaty.*

---

[*] We should read thus §. 297. for *byarĕ*, as accusative singular (see Olshausen, Vend. S. 43).

[1] More usually *paoirya*, masc. *paoiryô*, by which the Sclavonic *pervyĭ*, *pervaya*, is, as it were, prepared.

[2] Also *turîyâ*, masc. *turîya-s*, on which is based the Zend *tûirya*, masc. *tûiryô*. The suppression of the syllable *cha* might announce th looser connection of the same with the remaining portion of the wor and thereby support the conjecture expressed at §. 311.

[3] The *t* of *pyataya*, masc. *pyatyi*, has nothing in common with the *t* of the cardinal number *pyaty ;* the proper primitive is *pya* (see p. 430 Note †), whence *PYATI* by the suffix *TI*, and *PYATO*, fem. *PYATA*, by the suffix *TO*, fem. *TA* (see §. 322.). The same holds good with regard to *shestaya* in relation to *shesty*, &c.

[4] By transposition and syncope from *csvasta*, as must be expected from the cardinal number 𐬑𐬱𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬱 *csvas*.

[5] Regarding the *d* for *n*, see §. 317.

[6] See §. 319, Note *, p. 435.

"Remark.—As the old *a* of the preposition प्र *pra* has been weakened to *i*—as in *quinque*, answering to *panchan*—the Latin *prima* appears distinct from the preposition *pro*, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian *prathamâ*, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb *πρίν*, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition *πρό*. In the comparative *prior* only the *pr* of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the *i* belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the *m* of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition *pirm*, 'before'; but the unaltered *pra* stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also *pri*, 'by, before,' as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic *fruma* shews the same relation to *prathamâ* that the Latin [G. Ed. p. 464.] and Lithuanian do: the *u* of *fru* has arisen from *a* through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition *fram*, 'before, by,' &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian *pirm*, the superlative *m* is contained. On प्र *pra* is based, also, *faur*, 'before,' with transposition of the *u* of *fru-ma*, and with *a* prefixed, according to §. 82.

NUMERAL ADVERBS.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas "twice," "thrice," "four times," have been already discussed (p. 435, G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:—

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	OLD NORTHERN.
dwis,	*bis*,	*δίς*,	*bis*,	*tvis-var* (p. 436 G. ed.).
tris,	*thris*,	*τρίς*,	*ter*,	*thris-var*.
chatur,*	*chathrus*,	....	*quater*,	....

---

* According to §. 94. for *chaturs*.

The Greek forms in *κις* like *τετράκις*, *πεντάκις*, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but *κις* answers to the Sanskṛit *śas* (§. 21.), the *a* being weakened to *i*; this *śas*, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as *śataśas*, "by hundreds," *sahasraśas*, "by thousands," *bahuśas*, "of many kinds," *gaṇaśas*, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but *e.g.* *śataśas* is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in *ἑκατοντάκις* the repetition is strictly defined by the numeral. How stands it, then, with the Latin forms like *quinquies*, *sexies*, &c.? I believe that in respect to their suffix they are connected neither with the forms in *s* like *dwis*, *δίς*, nor with [G. Ed. p. 465.] those in *κις* (*śas*), by suppression of the guttural; but as *toties*, *quoties*, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced *quotiens*, *totiens*, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, *τιθένς* is more genuine than *τιθείς* (§. 138.), I therefore prefer bringing these forms in *ens*, *es*, into conjunction with the Sanskṛit suffix *vant* (in the weak cases *vat*), which signifies, in pronominal bases, "much," but elsewhere, "gifted with," and the nominative of which is, in Zend, *vaṅs*, e.g. *chvaṅs*, "how much," for *chivaṅs*. This suffix has, in Sanskṛit, in combination with the interrogative base *ki*, and the demonstrative base *i*, laid aside the *v*; hence *kiy-ant*, *iy-ant*—weak form *kiyat*, *iyat*—nominative masculine *kiyân*, *iyân*; this *ant* for *vant* answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine *εις*), *e.g.* in *μελιτόεις*, and also to the Latin *ens*, in *totiens*, *quotiens*, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in *nt*, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide *toti-ens* *quoti-ens*, or *tot-iens*, *quot-iens*? In the former case *tot*, *quot*, would have preserved, in this combination, the *i* which belongs to them, for they are based on the Sanskṛit तति *tati*, "so much," कति *kati*, "how much";* and the *ens* in *toti-ens* would, according to that, express the "time," and *toti*, "so much." In the division *tot-iens*, however, we should have to assume that in *iens*, the abovementioned demonstrative इयन्त् *iyant*, "so much," is contained, but in such wise, that only the meaning of the suffix is still perceived. Under this supposition *quinqu-ies* [G. Ed. p. 466.] would, accordingly, express "five-somuch" (times); in the former case, however, the *i*, as *quinqui-es*, *octi-es*, would have to pass as representative of the *e* and *o* of *quinque*, *octo*, and that of *sexies* as a conjunctive vowel, or as an accommodation to the prevailing analogy. In any case, however, the identity of the suffix *ens*, *es*, with the Sanskṛit *ant*, from *vant*, is highly probable. The Sanskṛit expresses the idea "times" from five upwards by *kṛitwas*; as, पञ्चकृत्वस् *panchakṛitwas*, "five times." This *kṛitwas* comes from *kṛit*, "making," which in *sakṛit*, "once," is sufficient of itself: the annexed *vas*, however, might, by exchange of the *t* for *s* (compare §. 156. Note *), have arisen from *vat*, which should be given above as the weak theme for *vant*; as, *tâvat*, "so much," *yâvat*, "how much" (rel.). With *kṛit* from *kart* (§. 1.) is clearly connected the Lithuanian *karta-s*, "time," a masculine substantive, which, like the defining number, is put in the accusative, in order to make up for the adverbs under discussion; *e.g.* *wienaṅ kartaṅ*, "once," *dù kartù*, "twice" (accusative *du*), *tris kartùs*, "three times." In Old Sclavonic the corresponding *krat* or *kraty* is not declined, and the former appears to be an abbreviation of the latter, for it cannot be brought into direct comparison with the Sanskrit कृत् *krit* on account of §. 255. (*l.*): *kraty*, however, is to be deduced from कृत्वस् *kritwas*, by suppression of the *v*. With regard to the *y* for *as* compare §. 271.

---

* These are neuters, which, in common with the numerals पञ्चन् *panchan*, "five," &c. (§. 313.), have, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative, a singular form; in the other cases, plural terminations; while in Latin *quot*, *tot*, like *quinque*, &c., have become completely indeclinable.

325. Through the suffix धा *dha* the Sanskrit forms adverbs in sense and in form, corresponding to the Greek in χα, which, therefore, have altered the *T* sound of the suffix into a corresponding guttural, by the usual exchange of organ in aspirates, as in OPNIX for OPNIΘ, and in the forms mentioned at p. 401 G. ed. Compare,

[G. Ed. p. 467.]

द्विधा *dwi-dhâ*,*	δί-χα.
त्रिधा *tri-dhâ*,	τρί-χα.
चतुर्धा *chatur-dhâ*,	τέτρα-χα.
पञ्चधा *pancha-dhâ*,	πέντα-χα.

---

* “Divided into two parts,” Sav. V. 108.

END OF VOL. I.

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 005 006 064

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-9201
All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

28D MAR 2 9 1995
APR 0 4 1995
28D MAY 0 2 1995
MAY 0 1995
JUN 3 0 2001
APR 1 8 2003